

their proceeds in certain banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 19282) for the relief of the cotton situation in certain Southern States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19283) authorizing a per capita payment to Choctaws and Chickasaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19284) to appropriate \$15,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, for preventing the spread of the pink boll worm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 646) to provide for the consideration of House joint resolution 241; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 647) requesting the President and the Secretary of the Navy to inform the House on certain matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution (H. Res. 648) to pay John J. Cameron \$500 for extra services during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19285) granting an increase of pension to John T. Harnish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 19286) granting a pension to David F. Boddie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19287) granting an increase of pension to Jane Amanda Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19288) granting an increase of pension to Junius R. Clift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19289) granting an increase of pension to Martin Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19290) granting a pension to Levi B. Roseberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 19291) granting an increase of pension to Dixon Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19292) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah W. Pickering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 19293) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Thorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 19294) granting an increase of pension to Deltrick Bruns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19295) granting an increase of pension to George S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19296) for the relief of John R. McClain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19297) granting a pension to Sarah L. Moredock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 19298) granting a pension to Rose Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of William B. Klahre, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on motion-picture theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Twentieth Century Manufacturing Co., of Boynton, Pa.; the Moxham Lumber Co., the Penn Traffic Co., and R. G. Morgart, all of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of D. K. Webster, B. Wilkins, George Altgoever, P. Mesiani, J. Ellner, F. Delucia, Abr. Ackerman, Joseph Altman, E. Gordesio, S. Berkowitz, J. Jannis, William Hammer, S. Aronsontom, G. Max Wornon, A. Allison, James Wilson, W. S. Gennis, H. Goldfarb, and V. Gayda, all of New York, N. Y., against tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Daniel R. Jones Co., of Milwaukee Wis., against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the board of directors of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against a

tax on sales of grain, etc., when made in exchanges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 15 business firms of Vallejo, Cal., in favor of House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of G. W. Blass, of Port Byron, N. Y., and Neeskin Co. and J. L. Hopkins & Co., of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of G. Morillo and others, retail druggists of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of F. C. Judevine, of Bellwood, and others, together with petitions from Gresham, Cordova, Beaver Crossing, Abie, Morse Bluff, Adams, Linwood, Prague, Malmo, Utica, Waco, Germantown, Goehner, Crete, Thayer, Seward, Surprise, Osceola, Rising City, David City, Shelby, and Brainard, all in the State of Nebraska, in favor of House bill 5308, to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of J. C. Koch, of St. Marys; A. M. Lowentritt, of Oil City; and H. M. Silman, of St. Marys, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of John C. Owsley, secretary and treasurer of the Sharon Retail Drug Association, of Sharon; G. G. Curry, of Greenville; Ross Drug Co., of Ridgway; John M. Siegfried, of Warren; W. A. Talbot, secretary and treasurer of the Piso Co.; C. Kembel & Son, of Tidioute; and J. W. Agrellius, of Youngsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of proprietary medicines and other drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of western Washington, protesting against war tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petition of 21 citizens of Westminster, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of William H. Fogas, Charles Dawson, and D. & R. Rosenbaum, all of Mount Vernon, Ind., protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of Branch No. 1, Local Barre of the Socialist Party of Vermont, in regard to the increase of the cost of living, and praying that the Government take over railroads, mills, mines, stores, and warehouses for the benefit of all people, and protesting against a tax on the necessities of life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bayden Grange, of Westminster, Vt., favoring acquisition of the telephone service by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of the Nashua Auto Club, of Nashua; W. C. Spear, of Manchester; and H. C. Lintott, of Nashua, all in the State of New Hampshire, against proposed Government tax based on horsepower of motor cars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petitions of the First Presbyterian Church and Sunday School and sundry citizens of Palmyra, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 15, 1914.

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Texas State Senate, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., October 14, 1914.

HON. CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following simple resolution, by Senators Henderson and Gibson, was to-day adopted by the Senate of Texas:

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we hereby endorse the amendment as proposed by the southern Senators and offered as an amendment to war-tax bill, wherein it is proposed that the National Government issue \$250,000,000 of 4 per cent three-year bonds, and that said bonds shall be used to purchase 5,000,000 bales of this year's cotton at 10 cents per pound, and providing that said cotton

shall not be sold by the Government until 1916 and 1917, and that we hereby request the Congress of the United States to pass said amendment, and that a copy of this resolution be wired to our Senators, Hon. CHARLES A. CULBERSON and Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD."

W. V. HOWERTON,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE MERCHANT MARINE (S. DOC. NO. 601).

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a paper on the subject of our American merchant marine and ask to have it printed in the RECORD and made a public document. It is not very long.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine of the House of Representatives in its report of September 8, 1914, on the Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, said:

"We shall not discuss the desirability of having an American merchant marine. We will assume that there is no difference of opinion on that point."

No one can honestly take issue with that statement of the committee. In order to establish an American merchant marine, the above committee, after full deliberation, favorably reported a bill authorizing the Government, acting through a shipping board composed of members of the Cabinet, under the direction of the President, to acquire and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, these vessels also to be available as naval auxiliaries.

There is an idea abroad that this bill is a war emergency measure. This is not so. In its report the committee says:

"The fact that we pay a sum variously estimated to be from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 annually to vessels under foreign flags, to transport our commerce, which seriously affects our balance of trade, is urged as a sufficient reason why we should have a merchant marine of our own; but this is only one of many reasons."

Long before the beginning of the present war the need for an American merchant marine was so keenly felt that the Senate passed a bill known as the Weeks bill, which proposed to use naval vessels as a nucleus for an American merchant marine.

Objections to the shipping bill now before Congress has developed from two sources. It was to be expected that there would be objection by shipping interests which have been reaping the benefit of American inactivity in the foreign shipping trade. It was also to be expected that certain financial interests and their affiliations, especially those interested in foreign shipping, would object to a Government merchant marine.

Opponents to the bill have advanced arguments to sustain their position, but not one of them will stand analysis. Many newspapers and periodicals are opposing the bill, but the fact that they enjoy considerable advertising and other patronage from the steamship lines and the financial interests that are opposing the bill may go far toward explaining their position on this great question of an American merchant marine.

(1) Opponents to the bill say that there are a large number of ships at present in American harbors unable to get cargoes; hence there is no need for a Government merchant marine.

A recent investigation has proven this not to be true. Ships seek cargoes at all times, but the present chartering market is very firm, and when the question of foreign credits is settled and commerce begins to move, as it must very shortly, there will be a positive famine in ships, as over 5,000,000 tons of German and Austrian shipping are completely out of commission, to say nothing of the large number of British, French, and Russian merchant ships which have been taken over by their respective Governments for transports and naval auxiliaries.

There are, all told, considerably less than 100 American ships in the foreign trade in the whole world, including all of the ships which have just taken American registry to secure the protection of the flag on account of the war. None of these ships are idle. Therefore, even though there were hundreds of idle ships in every American harbor, it would not alter the necessity for passing the shipping bill now before Congress, as all such ships would be foreign ships, and the object of this bill is to establish an American merchant marine.

(2) Opponents to the bill say that if the Government will not enter the shipping business private capital will provide an American merchant marine.

This is rather inconsistent with their statement that the harbors are full of idle ships, for if that is true private capital will find no attraction in the shipping business.

What likelihood is there to obtain private capital for this new business, especially to the amount contemplated by the shipping bill—\$40,000,000—when long-established, going concerns find it impossible to obtain money except at heavy rates.

When the city of New York must pay 7 per cent, including bankers' commissions, for a loan of \$100,000,000; when the State of Tennessee found it most difficult to obtain a loan of \$1,400,000, it is quite certain that private capital will be unable to provide an American merchant marine, especially as it did nothing in the matter while the opportunity was open during the past 50 years.

(3) Opponents to the bill say that the Government will lose much money in this business.

This argument has been their favorite one. The bugaboo of increased taxes, "loss of the initial investment every three years," and much more of the same nature has been circulated in an effort to defeat the bill.

The shipping business is one of the most profitable in the world. Special Diplomatic and Consular Reports, page 39, says:

"The White Star Line in 1910 earned a net profit of £540,000 sterling on a capital of £750,000 sterling after writing off £370,018 sterling for depreciation. A dividend of 30 per cent was paid in that year."

The Holland America Line earned about 50 per cent net on its capital during the first fiscal year of 1913. The Hamburg-American Line earned about 30 per cent net during its fiscal year of 1913. These are only a few specific instances of steamship-line earnings. They are not at all unusual, but are the regular thing in the shipping business.

F. E. Dixon & Co., of London, who own and operate a large fleet of "tramp" freighters, showed earnings of about 50 per cent net last year, which proves that steamship earnings are large in the irregular

services as well as in the regular lines. In fact, the profits in the steamship business are so large that frequently the entire cost of a ship is earned in two years.

The question will arise, Why have not Americans gone into such profitable business? The answer is, For the same reason that Americans have neglected the vast foreign export trade—they have been too busy with their industries at home.

But, unlike the export trade, which each manufacturer can work up individually, to establish an adequate merchant marine is so large an undertaking at this time and involves so large an amount of money that, if it is to be done at all, it must be done by the Government.

(4) Opponents to the bill say that there will be danger of the United States violating neutrality if it operates merchant ships at this time.

The report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine says:

"We have rights as neutrals as well as duties to be observed. * * * The President will have the State Department to advise him on all questions affecting our rights and duties as neutrals. * * * We should assume that the President and shipping board, in the exercise of any powers granted or duties imposed by this bill, will keep well within our rights as neutrals."

On this point Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo also says:

"The board proposed in this bill consists really of the President of the United States and certain Cabinet officers therein mentioned. I think there is no more punctilious citizen of the United States with respect to the neutrality of this country than the President of the United States. I think you may safely depend on it, if this bill is passed and this board is vested with power to act, that that power will be exercised in such a way that the neutrality of this country will be preserved."

(5) Opponents to the bill make an alternative proposition that we should build up an American merchant marine by granting subsidies.

Subsidy seekers have managed to create a belief that the merchant marines of European countries, especially the merchant marines of the two greatest maritime countries in the world—Great Britain and Germany—have been built up by granting subsidies to its shipping. Neither of these countries grants subsidies except to a very limited extent and for very special service.

The Hamburg-American Line, the largest and perhaps the most successful steamship company in the world, has never received a subsidy. A moderate subsidy was granted by Great Britain to the Cunard Co. in connection with the steamers *Mauretania* and *Lusitania*, but that was chiefly to keep the Cunard Co. from selling out to the International Mercantile Marine, the combination organized by J. P. Morgan & Co. Over 90 per cent of the total tonnage of Great Britain does not receive a farthing of subsidy.

It will surprise many to know that the United States pays a larger subsidy to four American ships owned by the International Mercantile Marine, namely, the *New York*, *Philadelphia*, *St. Paul*, and *St. Louis*, than is paid by any foreign nation for similar service. This country pays to these ships an annual subsidy of about \$735,000, and obtains practically nothing in return for this except the carrying of the mails on these steamers, which, at regular rates, would amount to only a trifling fraction of the amount of the subsidy. As a matter of fact, most of our mail goes forward on foreign ships, as they are much faster and they sail more frequently, the subsidized American ships being among the smallest and most out-of-date steamers in the North Atlantic trade.

The extraordinary large profits in the steamship business show that steamships can be operated profitably under the American flag without a subsidy, in spite of the somewhat higher wages and better living requirements of American seamen; therefore it will be well-nigh impossible to obtain a subsidy simply to make up the extra profits possible under foreign flags. For the same reason we will never have an American merchant marine unless it is established by the Government, because such private capital as may go into the foreign shipping business will operate under foreign flags to get the benefit of cheaper operation when the dangers of war are passed.

The present war has made it possible to secure, at most favorable prices, an excellent choice of modern, up-to-date steamers of different nationalities, also many steamers not yet out of the builders' hands, hence not yet nationalized, at less than the contract price. Also, as a result of the war, the financial success of the enterprise is more fully assured, as we will not have the competition of the warring nations to the same extent that we would have in times of peace.

The \$40,000,000 called for by the shipping bill will not be an expense, as the bill's opponents are pleased to call it, but it will be an investment of the first class without considering the enormous advantage to the whole people of the United States in having an American merchant marine under Government control and the great reduction in rates that will be possible, as the Government will not desire net earnings of from 30 to 50 per cent on its investment, but will be content with only a fair return.

It would be little short of a political and economic crime if we did not avail ourselves of the present almost unbelievable opportunity to do in a most practical manner that which Congress was endeavoring to do before the commencement of the war as best it could by means of the Weeks bill.

THE COTTON CROP.

Mr. OVERMAN. I present a telegram, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

AMERICUS, GA., October 14, 1914.

Senator OVERMAN,

Care United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your loyalty to the cotton cause. Don't give up the ship, for our very existence depends on your doing something. Distressed property already being advertised for sale. Absolutely no market for cotton at any price. All business paralyzed. Express our appreciation to Senator SMITH.

TAYLOR LEWIS,

For Citizens of Southwest Georgia.

Mr. OVERMAN. I also send to the desk a letter. I will ask that the first paragraph of it be read, and that the balance of it appear in the RECORD. It is from a leading farmers' paper of the South.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as requested, and the entire letter is as follows:

RALEIGH, N. C. October 12, 1914.

DEAR SIR: It will be an irreparable blunder if Congress adjourns without doing something to insure adequate currency for lending farmers to hold cotton until conditions become normal. This is an emergency condition, and emergency conditions require emergency measures. When the Salem, Mass., fire occurred did not Congress make an outright gift of \$2,000,000 to its people? When the war came on did not Congress levy extra taxes in order to keep \$75,000,000 in the national banks, and did not Leader UNDERWOOD declare the Government should have gone "to the rescue of these institutions whose solvency was jeopardized, not by any fault of their own but by the conditions coming from the war zone of Europe?"

Is it not equally true that the solvency of the southern farmers is now "jeopardized not by any fault of their own"? And while they ask no gift from Congress, they do ask that Congress help them to help themselves. They do ask that Congress provide sufficient currency at reasonable interest so they may borrow and carry the crop at their own risk and their own expense until conditions become normal again. President Wilson should not forget his own testimony against the "Money Trust" of New York, and should not forget that small southern banks can not take care of their ordinary obligations and carry this enormous burden of financing the cotton crop.

Cotton is already selling under 7 cents in Texas, and unless something is done before the millions of bales of distressed cotton go on the market November 1 can anyone say how much bankruptcy and disaster we shall witness?

President Wilson and Secretary McAdoo are great men, but Congress is responsible not to them but to the people. It should never adjourn without providing, not a gift but sufficient currency, which Secretary McAdoo declared would be available for "carrying the crop till a reasonable market can be found," but which present banking conditions do not provide.

Very truly, yours,

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a proposed amendment to the pending emergency revenue bill. I wish to say, however, that I heartily indorse the amendment introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. The South does not come here as a mendicant asking alms, but they are asking justice. They are asking the credit of the Government, and they will take care and pay back to the Government every cent advanced. In the event the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is not adopted I shall propose the following amendment, which I ask to have read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. OVERMAN to the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes, viz: Insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit and pay to each State a sum equal to the collections made from the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, or from any citizens or inhabitants thereof, or other persons, companies, corporations, or associations under act of Congress, approved July 1, 1862, and the amendatory acts thereto, for the purpose of aiding said States in assisting the producers of cotton in taking care of their surplus crop, which they are unable to sell by reason of the European war; to be used for the purchase of cotton by said States from the producers thereof, or making loans to the producers of said cotton under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Attorney General, and the governor of each of said States.

"SEC. 2. That the following sum shall be paid to each State, the same being the amount found upon the books of the Treasury of the United States as the amount collected from each of said States under said act: To the State of Alabama, \$10,388,072.10; Arkansas, \$2,555,638.43; Florida, \$918,944.98; Georgia, \$11,897,094.98; Kentucky, \$553,527.45; Louisiana, \$10,098,501; Maryland, \$51,349.52; Mississippi, \$8,742,995.93; Missouri, \$592,008.30; North Carolina, \$1,959,704.87; South Carolina, \$4,172,420.16; Tennessee, \$7,873,460.71; Texas, \$5,502,401.24; Virginia, \$657,588.58.

"SEC. 3. That said sum paid over to said States may be held for a term of five years subject to such disposition as Congress may hereafter provide.

"SEC. 4. That there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$85,963,598.31 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. That when loaned to the producers of cotton, the rate of interest on said sum shall not exceed 3 per cent per annum."

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to say that a direct tax was levied upon the cotton of the South by an act passed in 1862 during the Civil War and a tax of \$3 a bale on cotton collected in 1865-1868, when we were in a condition worse than the Belgians are to-day. All we ask is that this money be loaned to the South on this same product to take care of it in our present distressed condition.

PROPOSED LOAN ON CEREALS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], which I ask may be read and ordered printed.

The amendment was read and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Provided further, That whenever the price of No. 1 northern wheat at the principal terminal markets in the United States shall fall below \$1.10 per bushel; and whenever No. 1 barley shall fall below 65 cents per bushel; and whenever No. 1 white oats shall fall below 50 cents per bushel at such markets, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase all of said grains offered for sale, at said prices,

and to also purchase all other lower grades at such reduced prices as are generally recognized by commercial usage as the proper difference in value of such lower grades in the purchase and sale of grains.

It shall be the duty of the said Secretary of the Treasury to store and hold said grain so purchased until it can be resold at a profit of 2 cents per bushel.

To prevent the value of such grains falling below the aforesaid prices, the said Secretary of the Treasury shall prohibit all importations of such grains. If by reason of scarcity of production the price of any of the said grains shall rise above the price authorized to be paid, the said Secretary of the Treasury shall then allow importations until such prices shall have reached the standard of the purchasing prices herein mentioned.

The sum of \$500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to meet the expenses of this provision.

To secure the necessary funds to carry out this purchasing project, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue bonds of the United States, bearing 4 per cent interest, in such denominations as he may determine, and due five years from the date of issue; said bonds shall not be sold for less than par.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has recognized the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is it the Senator desires?

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will be patient, I will tell him in a moment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will be patient. I want the regular order to be proceeded with, but I will yield to the Senator if it takes only a short time.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a letter from the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of North Dakota, protesting against the provision in the pending revenue bill taxing grain.

I wish to say in this connection that I have conferred with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and, as I understand it, there will be an amendment offered which will change the provision as it is now in the bill. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to have the letter read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator desire the letter read or will he be content to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GRONNA. It is very brief. It consists of only a few lines.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; I will not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

PEKIN, N. DAK., October 10, 1914.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRONNA: My attention has been called to pages 22 and 23 of the revenue bill, which is now pending in Congress, wherein it proposes to tax grain sent from the farmers' elevator companies to the terminal market, also an equal tax if the grain is hedged. It may be useless or needless to file with you a protest against this measure, and you being a farmer, will certainly realize what this means to a grain-producing State like North Dakota, and, further, the equal injustice to the consumer. We therefore hope that you place every means in your power to have the proposed tax on grain set aside.

With personal regard, I beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

FARMERS' GRAIN DEALERS' ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA,
P. A. LEE, President.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LA JUNTA, COLO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is a bill which has passed the House of Representatives and been referred to the committee of the Senate and approved by the committee and is on the calendar. It is somewhat of an emergency measure. The amount of \$75,000 was appropriated for a public building at La Junta, Colo. The citizens contributed a site for it to the value of \$20,000. The department advertised for bids, and the bids were \$9,000 in excess of the amount which was appropriated. They are waiting to see whether they will accept that bid, which is a low bid, they say. This bill is for the purpose of making an additional appropriation of \$10,000. It seems to me that inasmuch as the town has contributed \$20,000 for the site the bill ought to be passed. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12665) to increase the limit of cost of a public building at La Junta, Colo.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not object, but I wish to say to the Senate that while I do not object to this I shall object to any further unanimous consent, and I shall ask for the regular order after this bill is disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at La Junta, Colo., be, and the same is hereby, increased \$10,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in bringing to the attention of the Senate the amendment to the tax bill which I offered on yesterday I wish to call attention to the fact that it is in no sense a political measure. I ask for it the consideration of Members on the other side of the aisle equally with those upon this side, and I hope to receive support from Members on the other side of the aisle equally with Members upon this side of the aisle.

I will be able to show that it is not simply a local question that is involved, but a national question. I will be able to furnish the best of authority to show that it is an international question and that it concerns the manufacturer and his interests almost equally with the producer of the unmanufactured staple. I contend that it is a problem which concerns the general welfare of the entire country.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Kern	Perkins	Smoot
Bristow	Lane	Pomerene	Sterling
Bryan	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Swanson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	Shafroth	Thompson
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Townsend
Gronna	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	West
Hollis	Overman	Smith, Mich.	White
Johnson	Page	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. He is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. He is detained on public business.

Mr. THORNTON. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. RANDELL], and I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the necessary absence and pairs of the following Senators:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]; and

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to state that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is still detained at his home on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. GORE and Mr. STONE answered to their names when called.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. WHITE. My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent, and will be for the day, having been invited to address the Legislature of South Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BORAH, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. WALSH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to say, in connection with presenting this amendment, that those of us who present it to the Senate are not wedded to it in its exact

terms. We are ready to accept criticism and to make modifications, if modification is deemed advisable. I expect to bring facts to the attention of the Senate which will show that this is a problem which concerns the general welfare of this country in its broadest sense. While it immediately concerns something over 12,000,000 white citizens and 6,000,000 colored citizens, it reaches beyond the producers; it concerns the welfare of all of the manufacturers of lint cotton in the United States. It goes beyond them; it concerns the business of the citizens of New England, of New York, of New Jersey, of Pennsylvania, of Ohio, of Wisconsin, of Indiana, of Illinois, and of Michigan. I shall bring to the attention of the Senate how deeply it concerns their commerce, and how directly many of their citizens to-day are involved in the handling of this product.

I shall go further and call attention to the international side of this question and to the manner in which it peculiarly concerns our international situation as well as the manufacture of this product as an international product.

The States that produce lint cotton, Mr. President—and it is distinctly an American monopoly, for the character of cotton which we produce, so necessary to the manufacturer of clothing for the world, can not be produced elsewhere—the States which produce it, naming them in the order of the quantity produced by each, are Texas, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Tennessee. Texas last year produced 3,905,000 bales; Tennessee produced 379,000 bales. I shall not stop to give the number of bales produced by each of the other States. Missouri, Florida, and Virginia also produced cotton, and States other than those before named and these three together produced 32,500 bales.

I wish, first, to call attention to some of the peculiarities of the product and of the marketing of the product. Of the 18,000,000 and more people who live in nine of these States, two-thirds of them are engaged in agriculture; and it is safe to say that over 10,000,000 depend directly upon the product of their cotton for their livelihood. Of that number I should say 6,000,000 were whites and 4,000,000 negroes.

Cotton is peculiar as an agricultural product in that the person producing it can do nothing with it but sell it. It is not like other agricultural products, something which can at least be partly consumed by the producer. It can not be manufactured at home. It must be sold, or it is useless to the producer.

Under the plan of production a large sum of money is spent from February until September to produce the crop, and then during the months of September and October it is harvested, money also being spent in connection with the harvest. When the crop is finally ready for market, it is at once sold, according to all past practice, at least the great bulk of it is sold, and the liabilities incurred in connection with production are met.

The resources of the banks, the resources of the merchants, the resources of the farmer are exhausted in the production of the crop, and they all rely upon the crop when it comes upon the market to pay up their obligations. Those obligations reach all over the United States, into the West, into the Middle West, into the North, and into the East.

Last year the crop was worth a billion dollars. Ninety days ago there was every reason to believe that the crop of this year would be worth a billion dollars and that to-day the money of England and of other foreign countries would be pouring into the South, into these States, buying the crop and furnishing the resources to settle the obligations of that section to the other States of the Nation. We understand what has caused the change. The last of July war broke out.

A large part of these farmers, especially the negroes, have little resources. They depend absolutely, to live, upon what their cotton sells for. They have gone on credit as long as they can. Their livelihood during the coming winter depends upon the surplus which comes from the cotton. This is not limited to the negro; a large number of white farmers depend absolutely, for a living and for their opportunity to go through the winter, on the sale of their cotton, and the very strongest of the farmers and planters depend upon the disposal of their cotton to meet their liabilities. This is the day, October 15, that about one-half their liabilities mature, and from now on for the next 30 days they mature continually. It is upon this crop that the liabilities depend, both that the debtor may settle and the creditor may have something. The merchants all through this section depend also upon the crop to meet their liabilities to the larger merchants and the manufacturers of the Eastern and Middle States. The bankers depend upon it for the settlement of their notes maturing to-day and within the next 30 days, to settle their liabilities to bankers from Boston to Chicago, and farther on west, in St. Louis and Kansas City. The whole business fabric of this section rests

for its conduct upon a market for this crop. It is all sold at about this time each year, according to past experience. I say "all"; I mean, practically all.

Let me again emphasize the distinction that should be drawn between cotton and other agricultural products. The farmer raises his corn or his wheat, and he lives off of it; he feeds his stock and his cattle off of it, and he can continue to live off of it without selling it; but the cotton producer can receive nothing from his cotton until he sells it. He can get nothing out of it to support his family until he sells it.

Mr. President and Senators, 60 per cent of this crop is shipped abroad each year under normal conditions. I have here a list of the countries to which it goes, or to which it went last year. These figures refer to bales of 500 pounds each.

Great Britain took 3,281,000 bales, and manufactured that quantity.

Germany manufactured 1,258,000 bales.

Russia, 376,000 bales.

France, 787,000 bales.

Austria, 626,000 bales.

Belgium, 171,000.

Over half of this crop last year was manufactured by the countries now in war. The cotton product sold abroad last year brought \$610,000,000, which went into the commerce of our country to give it vigor and force. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPETT] stated a few weeks ago that as a manufacturer it was to his interest that cotton should bring a good price; that it was vastly more important to the manufacturers of New England than this \$610,000,000 should be the price of our cotton sold abroad, to give force and power to the commerce of our entire country, than that he should save a few cents per pound in the purchase and the country should be the weaker as a whole as a result of the lower price of the raw material. Upon the floor of the Senate the senior Senator from Rhode Island made substantially that statement only a few weeks ago.

Let me call your attention to another fact. Last year, during the months of August and September, we exported 1,187,500 bales of cotton. During the past two months we exported 146,000 bales of cotton.

During the past five years cotton has sold for an average of 12.74 cents per pound. During the past 10 years it has averaged about 12 cents per pound. Now what is the situation? Sixty per cent of the market has been practically withdrawn and absolute paralysis of the trade in lint cotton has followed. It is not a case of overproduction; it is a normal production. It is the European war that has paralyzed the industry. For 10 years the price of cotton has averaged nearly 12 cents a pound, for the past 5 years 12½ cents a pound, and now what is it? There is no price.

A few weeks ago I expressed the fear that the price would drop to 6 cents a pound. I expressed it upon the floor of the Senate, and I was assured by many that my fear was ungrounded. You can not sell it at 6 cents a pound to-day if you put it on the market in any quantity. It has sold as low as 4 cents a pound and 3 cents a pound. The bankers can not loan on it. They do not know what it is going to sell for.

I recognize the fact that my burden would be heavy were I claiming that the Government should stand behind the producer of crops and protect him in normal conditions. This, however, is an unprecedented condition. It never has happened before. It is my earnest prayer that the conditions abroad never may happen again. There is no precedent for this situation in the cotton trade. I pray there never may be one again.

I have here letters that assure me that cotton has been taken into the smaller towns in my State and in Texas, and they have not been able to get a bid on it. It has sold at places, in small quantities, as low as 3 cents a pound. It is quoted now at 6 cents a pound, but very few sales are made. If you should undertake to market the crop as it normally should be marketed, you could not sell it at all.

Senators, what will be the consequence if nothing is done? It has cost in the neighborhood of 10 cents a pound to produce it. On the most economical basis next year it will cost 8 cents a pound. It can not be produced at less, on the average. There are places and men of special skill who will raise it for less; but with the character of labor which we must use for much of the production, the average cost can not be brought to less than about 8 cents a pound; and if I made that statement in the South I would be at once called to account for the statement, with the declaration that I had underestimated the cost 2 cents a pound.

It is a product that time does not injure. Cotton fairly well stored, kept out of rain, is as good 50 years after it is picked as it is the day it is picked. Moths do not injure,

Weevils do not consume it. There is no animal or insect, after it is picked, that touches it to injure it. There is no other agricultural product which can be cared for with the simple ease that cotton can be cared for and which, like cotton, never deteriorates as the result of age.

The world must be clothed out of our American cotton. It is one of our greatest national assets. The world must have it a short time hence to clothe the people of the world. Is this industry now to be destroyed?

I said that the manufacturer suffered. I read from the greatest authority in the world on this subject. Sir Charles W. Macara, president of the International Federation of Master Cotton Spinners and Manufacturers' Association, in a letter of August 31, stated:

The purpose of this letter is to confirm to you the statement made by our secretary on Saturday that it would be a great calamity if, owing to the European war, the cotton farmers of the United States of America were ruined. Their ruin will certainly be brought about unless steps are taken by the Government of the United States of America, in combination with large financial houses, to hold back several million bales of cotton. It must be borne in mind that if the war lasts longer than the end of this year there will be a surplus of American cotton of some 5,000,000 bales, and this must necessarily have a depressing effect on the price of American cotton, and the producer will necessarily be the greatest sufferer in the end. It is neither to the interests of the cotton spinners of the world nor to that of the United States of America as a nation that the price of cotton be reduced to such a low level as, say, 6 or 8 cents.

He wrote that the last day of August. Cotton is down to 6 cents, and it has still no stable demand. There is no bottom. Wiped out will be our balances from abroad if they absorb the cotton at this price. Wiped out will be one-half of the farmers of the South, white as well as black, who cultivate cotton. It will not pay their debts. Many a small farmer will find that the balance of his debts for which he has mortgaged his little farm, or mortgaged, with a homestead waiver, his stock, after his cotton is sold will wipe out all he has and leave him almost with starvation confronting him during the coming winter. A serious part of this problem is, What will this great child race of negroes that is on us do, and what will we do with them? What menace will they become?

Again, the president of the International Spinners and Manufacturers declares that the whole trade in the manufacture of cotton has been demoralized by the demoralization in the price of the raw material. Put down, as it is, to a price far below the cost of production, it is known that the price is temporary.

The raw material put upon a basis of fluctuation as to selling price leaves the consumer of the manufactured product where he does not know what to give. The merchant who would buy the output of a mill finds his trade in chaos and is unable to move it. The best authority from the spinners and manufacturers is that their trade is paralyzed by this condition of the trade in the raw material.

So I extend it from a problem of the 18,000,000 planters or cotton producers to the broader trade of the entire country, extending to the manufacturers and to the merchants who handle the manufactured product.

But let us go a little further. Let me take the State of Michigan. That State ships into the South thousands of automobiles. All over the South there are offices rented and forces employed by the manufacturers of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, and other States engaged in the sale of this one product. In the city of Atlanta, where I live, there are more than 100 agents. I was there a week ago, and I was told by them that every sale had stopped and that they would be compelled to discharge every employee with whom they did not have a yearly contract. It means failure, bankruptcy, for one-half of the producers; and then, a little later, it will mean the same thing for merchants and bankers, and will reach into the pockets of the whole country.

The papers of Wisconsin declare that trade in their cheese products is paralyzed because the South, their great customer, no longer buys.

I present it as a national problem. I present it as a problem which concerns the general welfare of the entire country.

I was urged by our producers of naval stores to seek to do something for them. I replied: "Yours is not a problem involving the welfare of the entire country. Yours is a personal problem of a number of good men in a few States. It is not a great national problem; yours is not in the same class as the cotton problem, and I can not endeavor to do for you what you have in mind."

The New York Herald of yesterday states that—

There was no improvement in the character of spot news from the South. While it is obvious that farmers are holding the bulk of their crops, such cotton as is forced for sale finds comparatively few buyers, and prices appear to be steadily working lower. They have already reached a level far below the most conservative estimate of the cost of

production, and so far as can be learned domestic mills are still buying only for their more immediate needs.

Local spot handlers said yesterday that their offers were anywhere from one-eighth to one-fourth cent lower than on Friday morning, and it was reported that strict middling cotton was being offered from Norfolk delivered at New England mill points at 7½ cents.

It is lower now. That price of 6 cents has only been maintained because of the refusal of the farmer to sell; by the fact that it is piled up around the farmer's house and he declines to take it to town.

I have letters, a few extracts from which I desire to read; first, a telegram from a man interested in a number of banks:

Cotton selling in many towns now in Georgia from 4 to 6 cents today. No buyers in many towns at 6 cents.

Now I will read from a careful student of the question residing in Georgia. His letter reached me this morning:

It is impossible for any demand under the present situation to take care of the distress cotton. The cheaper the cotton the more distress cotton will be thrown on the market. While the crop has been made at an approximate cost of 10 cents per pound, the larger part of this cost, and in many instances all of the cost, has already been advanced. These advances are now becoming due, and while our merchants, bankers, fertilizer people, and other mediums of credit are willing to forbear collections and further extend credit, and would do so if cotton had any stable value, they are becoming demoralized and frightened by the rapidly falling price of cotton. This panicky and hysterical situation is forcing more and more cotton on the market, and further depressing the price and value of cotton as security for credit.

If this condition continues, it will result in a series of bankruptcies, foreclosures, forced sales—not only of cotton but of all other tangible assets on the market without purchasers and without money to buy—and will ultimately lead to such paralysis of all business and enterprise in the cotton belt of the South as to render this section unable to carry on practically any kind of farming operations next year, and, in my opinion, the cotton acreage, as well as all other agricultural acreage in the South for 1915, will be far more radically reduced than by any suggested or contemplated legislation which has been made, either National or State. The ultimate results from such experience will destroy far more values in the South than the entire cotton crop even in a normal year.

To what extent these losses will fall upon other sections of our country I can not tell. But necessarily the East and West, who are large creditors of the South, will bear their respective portions of the losses. Ultimately the cotton mill industries of this country, as well as of other countries, will appreciably feel and sustain these losses, for if the South's ability to carry on farming operations is unduly crippled or destroyed and cotton production is abnormally reduced the result will necessarily be high-priced cotton, probably, next fall, and then the cotton mills will themselves go through another period of disastrous financial operations.

I read from another letter from a legislator residing in middle Georgia. His letter also reached me this morning:

To-day cotton in Macon is selling at 6½ cents, and no demand. I learn that farmers in Macon and in Danville on Saturday sold good cotton at 4½ and 4½ cents. If the cotton crop continues to be sold at this price and at much lower prices, to which it will inevitably go unless the Government comes to the assistance of the staple, the result will be that 15,000,000 bales of cotton, which is intrinsically worth \$900,000,000, will be sold for \$450,000,000, which means a loss in gold to America of \$450,000,000—more than the cost of the Panama Canal.

And, mark you, this loss does not fall upon the southern cotton farmer alone, because out of that money the State of Georgia buys from the East and West \$175,000,000 of foodstuffs.

I saw in the National Packer a few days since a quotation from some market in Wisconsin to the effect that the cheese market was very dull, and had gone off in value on account of the lack of southern demand.

Just think for a moment how a loss of the purchasing power to the South of \$450,000,000 in this year's crop will affect the producers of those commodities, which have been sold to the South for years.

Think also how it will affect the South's purchasing power for next year and the year after that.

The solution of this question, in my opinion, is easy, provided the northern, eastern, and western Senators and Members of Congress can see and know that if the cotton crop is sacrificed, as it evidently will be, that the calamity is much more of a calamity of the North and East than it is of the South.

Mr. President, the assessed value of nine of these Southern States chiefly interested in cotton raising for 1912 was \$6,827,800,000. I say to you without a moment's hesitation, without a doubt, that unless something is done to meet this great emergency those values will be reduced by next year 25 per cent. This is a conservative estimate. It is not simply the loss of the cotton crop; it is a blow to the entire section, a great part of our country.

Ah, gentlemen, I speak of a part of the country which our brethren of the North insisted should remain in the Union, and for which their splendid boys fought under the Stars and Stripes, and whose splendid service in keeping the South in the Union we so often hear about with admiration, and to whom we have paid \$4,500,000,000 in pensions for keeping these States of the South in the Union. Now, if we were worth so much to the Union, if it was so desirable that we should stay in the Union—and I am glad we are in it; do not misunderstand me for a moment on that subject—if we were worth so much, is it not worth something to save these States to-day?

But it is not simply saving the South; it is saving the commerce of the country. I see my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I say to him that the greatest manufacturing industry perhaps in his State will be jarred unless we can

do something to save this condition in the South. Michigan sells by far more automobiles in the South than any other State in the Union. Their agents have places of business all over the South. They are not selling a machine now, and they can not collect the debts that are due them, and if this condition goes on, foreclosures will not collect debts.

It is a war situation, and it is a situation as distressing and as serious as has ever been brought on by a flood in Ohio or a fire in Salem, Mass., or an earthquake at Charleston or an earthquake at San Francisco. The Treasury has been freely used in such emergencies. It is as serious to 5,000,000 people as was the condition of our 50,000 who were abroad a short time ago and who wanted to get home. We furnished \$2,500,000 to bring these travelers home. May we not loan the credit of the Government to save those who "stayed by the stuff"?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Will the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to interrupt the Senator in the course of his presentation of this matter, but if he would prefer it, before he closes I wish to ask some questions in regard to a practical feature of it as a matter of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will come to that a little later on. I am seeking first to present the broad question to the Senate as I see it. I know there are Democrats who have a narrower view of our governmental power than I have. I believe in the power of the Government, the right and duty of the Government, as occasion requires, if it makes really a case of general welfare, to use its power not to interfere with the rights of a citizen where the special delegation of authority has not been given, not to interfere with the rights of a State where the special designation of power has not been given; but without interfering with the right of either to come to the help in the interest of the general welfare of the people of the country.

We spent \$400,000,000 on the Panama Canal. The commerce of our country involved in this question involves more for the next 5 years than the Panama Canal will contribute in 50 years, and the Panama Canal is a continuing burden. We come to you with a proposition which involves not one dollar of burden upon the National Government.

Now, Mr. President, I might go into details to show how the commerce of New York City, how the commerce of Boston, how the commerce of all the New England States is affected by this problem.

I stop a moment to say that I understand all over my State orders to New England for shoes have been suspended or canceled within the past 60 days. I met the representative of a large New England manufacturing house engaged in the manufacture of shoes and was told that he was going home, that nobody would buy anything. Why should they, with the certainty that they had nothing as things stood to pay with, and why should the manufacturers want to sell?

Mr. President, the plan which we present is not intricate. It is conceded that we have at least a surplus of 5,000,000 bales which will not be consumed by the mills next year. I think it will hardly be questioned that within the next two or three years the world will need this cotton. It will need vastly more than this cotton if the agricultural paralysis takes place in those States next year which is in front of them, because little will be produced.

This bill proposed no issue of paper money to burden the Treasury to be maintained by additional gold reserve. It proposes no inflation of the currency. It proposes the issue of \$250,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds due on or before three years from date, issued in small denominations of \$10 up. It proposes that these bonds shall not be sold upon the market, but shall be exchanged for cotton in the States in proportion, as far as possible, as the States have produced cotton.

It proposes that this cotton shall be taken off the market during the next year, with, however, the privilege that a board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Agriculture, if the manufacturers should consume the crop offered for sale and need part of the 5,000,000 bales may let them have it.

It proposes that in 1916 again cotton shall be sold from these 5,000,000 bales as the demand calls for it, and that not later than July 1, 1917, all of it shall be sold.

It proposes to levy a tax as an excise tax on the cotton producers, beginning with half a cent in 1916 and a cent a pound in 1917 to meet the deficit, if there be any deficit, on the sale of this cotton by the Government. One per cent a pound on a normal crop will be \$75,000,000. If the crop is reduced, of course the price of the 5,000,000 bales will become normal, which is between 12 and 13 cents. If the crop is reduced, the

5,000,000 bales would easily sell for more than enough to pay the bonds, interest on them, and the expense of handling the cotton. If it does not pay it, though, 1 cent a pound on a 10,000,000-bale crop would be \$50,000,000.

We are not here as mendicants; we are not here seeking to reach our hands into the National Treasury and take care of ourselves from the taxes paid by others. We are proposing to carry our own burden finally. We are proposing to free the Government and the people of the entire country from the loss of a dollar as a result of the aid which will carry us through this great crisis, and enable us to settle our debts to our northern and eastern and western friends, and tide over this war condition until things are normal, and then pay back every dollar through the industry itself, if there is a dollar which it costs the Government to help us do it.

One clause of the amendment provides for a tax next year of 2 cents a pound on all the cotton produced in excess of one-half this year's crop. I do not think that will raise much revenue, because I do not believe that next year's crop will exceed one-half this year's crop; but the following year, 1916, we propose to put a half cent a pound on all cotton produced to meet the interest and expenses of caring for the cotton, and the year following a cent a pound, if any loss exists, and to continue a cent a pound each year until every loss is met. I repeat, a cent a pound on this year's crop would produce \$75,000,000.

Senators, I do not know that we have found the solution of this question, but I do ask you to forbear before you reach an adverse conclusion. Stop to think about it; give us the benefit of a consideration; and may I say, quoting from an editorial in a newspaper that I read a few days ago, I believe that the best legislation comes from a combination of heart and head? I do not believe that the wisest mode of handling a great problem which concerns the people of this country is to eliminate all heart; I believe, finally, in the action of the judgment, and I beg you do not at once precipitate an adverse conclusion. Confer with us; think about it; help find what can be done. If we have not the right plan, help us find one.

The welfare of our whole country is involved; the welfare of your citizens is involved; our trade relations abroad are involved; our obligations to other sections of the country—your sections—are involved. Help us study out what is best, if we have not found it. We wanted to find a plan that would place no burden on the Treasury; we wanted to find a plan by which we could come before you and say, "We will carry our own burdens if you will allow us the benefit of the Government's credit and cooperation in this way for two or three years"; but if there is a better way, if there is some objection to this plan, if there is a better plan, help us find it. Do not, sir, simply with the idea that you are going to fight what we have suggested, put yourselves in the frame of combating any and all action. See it, I beg you, in its broad light. Take a little while to think about it before you reach a conclusion. Do not spring to immediate opposition.

During the present session of Congress we have voted \$35,000,000 in money to build railroads in Alaska, and we put into that bill a provision that anything that comes from the mines shall stay in Alaska. Is that for the general welfare? That is to develop Alaska, to make it possible for people to go there. If there is a loss, we all bear it; if there is a gain, Alaska gets it. Our cotton plan is one by which, if there is a loss, cotton bears it; if there is a gain, the Government gets it. We are asking you to help save some people who are already on the soil and tilling it.

We voted two and a half million dollars to bring back travelers from abroad. We are asking you to take care of some people who stayed by the stuff. We have voted nearly \$80,000,000 for reclamation purposes in the West; we indorsed \$120,000,000 of bonds to build railroads in the West. I am not objecting to it.

We have spent \$600,000,000 on the Philippines that we are going to give up as soon as we sufficiently civilize the Filipinos to enable them to take care of their own affairs—a broad philanthropy.

We, 18,000,000 of your own people, come and ask cooperation to handle the severest blow that has fallen on any section of this country since the Civil War.

Senators, do not strike before you think; do not oppose before you have time for the calmest consideration of the subject. While you are objecting to what we suggest, try to think of something better. I ask for mental operation, lit up by the light of kindly hearts.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer upon this subject now. I thank Senators for their attention.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, while I think that most of us who have been here more than half a dozen years have realized the rapidity with which we, through our legislation, are being driven into the field of paternalism, I do not think there is anyone in the Senate who has not been astounded by the mighty advance in that direction which is proposed in the pending amendment, which is that the Government shall proceed, whenever any one of the industries of the people becomes unprofitable, to make it profitable; and if there is not sufficient demand for the product that the Government shall purchase that product and hold it out of the market until it reaches a profitable price.

Mr. President, much as I am opposed to paternalism, great as is my antagonism for socialism, I must say that if we are going to take a step of this kind, let us be fair with every one of our people and every one of our industries and go into the socialistic ford heart and soul; let us raise the banner of paternalism, conduct everything by the Government, and let the citizen be the servant of the Government, to receive compensation for his wages according to standards fixed by the Government. That is what this measure finally leads to.

I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] when he says that the Senators on his side of the Chamber, especially those from the South, take too limited view of the authority of the General Government. I have never known them to take such a limited view whenever the question was one of appropriation or one which could help out their particular section of this country. They have taken that view only, it seems to me, when it operated as a good argument to defeat some measure which they desired to defeat.

The Senator has not given us all the information that we ought to have in order to determine whether or not the southern section of this country is in the dire straits which he has depicted. I have read this morning a statement showing that for the last year there has been no other section of the country so prosperous as the southern section. There has been none so unprosperous as my own section during the same time.

I do not know what you mean by "a normal cotton crop," but my understanding is that your cotton crop is considerably in excess of normal this year and considerably in excess of what the average has been for the last 10 years. If I am in error in that, of course I can be corrected.

We have always found in the case of our agricultural products that whenever we had a little more than the normal crop our prices went down very much indeed. We have taken that as a matter of course, and have assumed that we have had to deal with that condition ourselves; but you have helped to make our condition still worse by providing that whenever we have a short crop that will lift our prices up so that we can barely make a living, you will allow the Canadian surplus and the Argentine surplus to be thrown in upon our country and thereby drive our prices down.

I have been told again and again by southern Members that if they were sure of securing 10 cents a pound for their cotton they could make good money, and that if they could get 12 cents they would be exceedingly prosperous.

Now, if I may call the Senator's attention to conditions in our section of the country—and we have never asked for any Government support—if you receive 8 cents a pound for your cotton, you are getting a better price, measured by the cost of production, than we are getting to-day for our northern cereal products. In my State to-day, in spite of the European war, which is said to raise the prices of products, our oats are only bringing about 37 cents a bushel, and barley in the interior part of the State is worth only 35 cents a bushel. Our cereal crop this year is short, and we should receive greater prices per bushel, but we are not securing those better prices because of foreign importations.

You can not hire your help and raise a bushel of barley for 60 cents a bushel; you can not hire your help and raise a bushel of oats for 40 cents a bushel. We are getting about 70 cents a bushel for our wheat in North Dakota. You can not hire your help and raise that wheat and make a profit at 90 cents a bushel. We have been able to live only because we put our labor in at nothing. We, of course, get our board, such as it is, and the little clothing we wear, but in order to make both ends meet we can not allow ourselves wages, and yet we have not called upon the Government to give us assistance.

Let me call the Senator's attention to the condition in 1894 and 1895. Why, Mr. President, the Senator has stated that in the case of grain the farmer can live off of it in some way, but that he can not live off of his cotton. Well, perhaps during the Stone Age, or along during the age of the cave man, humanity was possessed of molars capable of grinding grain. In the

twentieth century we can not do that; we have got to sell our wheat and buy flour; and, although the Senator from Georgia thinks that we can eat the raw wheat and raw corn. I want to assure him that they would be very indigestible, and I doubt if the teeth of the people of the present century would allow them to live in that manner.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question really for information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will ask the Senator, have you not local mills in the neighborhood to grind your local wheat?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the old toll mill is a thing of the past. You sell your wheat and you buy flour.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My reason for asking the question was that, when I was a boy in western North Carolina, I have driven a good many loads of wheat to the mill, had it ground, left my toll, and brought my flour home. I supposed that some such condition still exists.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I also did that when I was a boy; but the Senator and I both know that the world has taken several strides since we were boys.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know that; but still I thought there was a local mill.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not doing business along that line; and I doubt if it is even doing business in the South along that line.

Now, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact, when he says that they can not do anything with the cotton, that in 1895 the people of Kansas had to burn their corn to keep warm. They absolutely could not get anything for it; they used it for firewood. Kansas did not come to the Government and ask that it support the State of Kansas, and that it buy corn at 40 or 50 cents a bushel and hold it. In 1895 I sold a great many bushels of oats at 10 cents a bushel. I could not raise those oats for 40 cents a bushel at that time. In fact, considering that they were sold by measure and that the weight is considerably more than the measure, they realized only about 8 cents a bushel. At the same time we were selling wheat for from 35 cents a bushel to 45 cents a bushel. We managed to get along. We believed in State rights and State responsibility to some extent, and we thought that the two went together. So when the farmers in my State had their wheat taken by mortgages during those hard times, and when they had crop failures by drought and otherwise, the State again and again came to their assistance and bought them seed wheat and started them in business. It never occurred to us that the Government should become our purchaser at fair profits.

The State stood back of them, and had it not been for that many of them would have become bankrupt. It never occurred to the other side of the Chamber at that time, when you were receiving pretty fair prices for your cotton, that you would bond the Government to the extent of a few hundred million dollars to take care of the crop in the Northwest.

We have never asked for any sort of a loan to help us out, but if the Government is going to make a corner on cotton to give its price a boost, then, of course, we want to come in. We have asked only one thing, and that is so to protect our markets by proper legislation as to give us the American market—give us the first opportunity in that market. You denied that with your votes; and yet, because you can not get into the German market by reason of the war, you ask us to go down into our pockets to raise the taxes to pay the interest on the bonds, and finally the principal, in order that the Government may buy your crop and keep it and hold it for a better price.

Mr. President, if we are going into that I have an amendment to the Senator's amendment that the Government should buy my oats and barley and wheat for a price compared with the cost of labor that will be just equivalent to what you are asking the Government to put in for your cotton this year. Socialism or paternalism, to my mind, is vicious, but if we have it for part of the country we must have it for the whole. Now, I am not going to take the view of the Senator that the South can not live another year with the prosperity it has had in the past. It certainly has all of the American market for its product. It certainly has had prosperity during the last year. I only know one country that is now cut off by the war that takes the exports of cotton from this country, and that is Germany. We can still send it to France and to Great Britain, and there is little doubt that our own spindles will take care of a greater proportion during the next year than they did during the last year.

The Senator quoted from a statement that I presume he took from the paper which I have here with me, and I want to read some figures in that same statement.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator made the statement that the Northwest was going to be called upon to pay a portion of the interest and the principal of the bonds that are proposed to be issued under this bill. I do not understand that that is the proposition at all. I understand that the principal and the interest are to be paid by the people who, in this emergency, are to be given the credit of the Government to relieve them; that a tax is to be levied upon the cotton that is produced hereafter sufficient to take care of that entire indebtedness.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, bonds are to be issued; the entire people of the United States will have to pay the interest on those bonds, and whether or not they will get it back again from the particular section that is to be benefited is problematical. They may and they may not.

I notice here, in the statement published on October 14, that—Cotton consumed during September was 415,194 bales, exclusive of linters, compared with 442,435 in September last year.

Almost the same; a very slight falling off. Why, if the Senator would take time to look up the statistics he would find that our grain exports have fallen off more than the difference in the consumption here.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was the consumption in the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not give the foreign consumption at all. I did not claim that the consumption in the United States would fall off. What I was seeking to show was the loss of our foreign trade.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that. But I want to show that you will have a steady market for what we have here, provided you take advantage of the means you have at your disposal in the South, with the great banks that offer to take and to extend loans to cover your cotton for a year.

Consumption for the two months ending September 30 was 798,874 bales against 874,785 last year.

In other words, you have used a great deal more this year than last year.

Cotton on hand September 30 in manufacturing establishments was 556,068 bales compared with 614,581 a year ago—

Or considerably less—

and in independent warehouses, 1,661,856, compared with 1,295,155 a year ago.

I find from the same statement that—

Cotton spindles active numbered 30,562,185 against 30,634,381 a year ago—

Or practically the same—

Linters consumed was 27,389 bales against 27,697 a year ago—

And I might give a number of other things that show that, at least, the home demand is about normal.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I want to ask the Senator if he can state the exports this year and last year to the warring countries?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Georgia gave that information from the same article, and therefore I did not think it was necessary for me to repeat the same figures that he put into the Record a very short time ago. Of course the exports have fallen off immensely.

Mr. GORE. Something like a million bales for the months of August and September of this year?

Mr. McCUMBER. Somewhere about that.

Here is another article, published this morning in the Washington Post, which would indicate that there is no section of this country so poverty stricken that it can not take care of its own matters without calling upon the Government for assistance:

SOUTH LED ALL SECTIONS OF NATION IN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT LAST YEAR.

NEW YORK, October 14.

Reports of the railroads of the United States to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the year ended June 30, 1914, throw an interest-

ing light on the development of the South during the year as compared with other parts of the country.

One of the best measures of the progress of a community is afforded by the gross operating revenues of its railroads. Measured by this standard, the South is the only section of the country that did a larger business during the fiscal year than in the last preceding 12 months—

In other words, it is the one section of the country that has been more prosperous than the preceding year—

In the southern district, embracing the territory south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers and east of the Mississippi River, there was an increase of \$215 per mile, or 2 per cent.

These figures show that the falling off in business in all other parts of the United States during the fiscal year did not limit southern development as a whole, but that, while some lines of business may have been affected by the falling off in demand in other parts of the country, there was a substantial growth in the business of the South as a whole.

In the light of these facts it is reasonable to suppose that when the temporary depression resulting from the crisis in the cotton market has been passed over the South will again lead all other parts of the United States in its rate of business development.

If the Senator will again refer to the normal output or production of cotton in the United States and compare it with the normal production of, say, wheat in the United States, he will find that there is a much greater surplus on wheat, according to the reports of the Agricultural Department, than there is on cotton, the result of which surplus greatly depresses our price.

We are getting, as I say, about 77 cents a bushel in my State for our wheat. The Agricultural Department estimated some time ago that we would raise this year about 900,000,000 bushels. The probabilities are that that estimate was very excessive, but it is fair to say that we have probably raised 800,000,000 bushels. If we raise 800,000,000 and consume but 600,000,000 for seed and bread, we must dispose of 200,000,000 outside; and while we are disposing of that 200,000,000, the entire crop of the northwest of Canada is pouring into our State, and because it is the nearer market at the same price you will see that we may run up to 300,000,000 bushels that must be exported in wheat or in flour. That depresses our price, and we are just as much entitled to have those prices put upon a living basis, by asking the Government to appropriate \$500,000,000 to do that, as you are entitled to ask that any other business shall receive the support of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has made one of the most remarkable speeches that has ever been uttered in this Chamber—remarkable from the standpoint of its unspeakable inconsistency. He charged us with being guilty of paternalism, of appealing to the Government when we should not do so, saying that we should take care of our own; that no business should appeal to the Government for support in any emergency; and yet he has been one of the strongest champions in this Chamber of the system of protection, the fundamental object of which is Government taxation of all the people for the support of particular industries.

If we needed an example, if we needed a precedent for anything of a paternalistic character, all that would be necessary would be to cite the system advocated by the Senator here on many former occasions, and to the principles he has so vigorously advocated. He blossoms out here as a champion of State rights, of State action; and yet, sir, the system that he has advocated taxes all the people to maintain the prices of articles produced in some of the States. He is unfair enough to base his criticisms on the fact that the home demand for cotton is as great this year as it was last year, and yet everybody who knows the industry knows that the home demand is only one-third of the entire demand, and that if we had only the American demand to depend upon absolute ruin would overwhelm the South.

I had hoped that this measure would meet with a note of sympathy on the other side of the Chamber, and that the speeches would not be characterized by a spirit of chastisement and criticism, a spirit that has little place in an emergency of this character and at a time like this.

I want to say that in contrast to the spirit evidenced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is the encouragement that has been given the "Buy-a-bale-of-cotton" movement throughout the North. While that movement has not involved a solution of the problem, yet it has evidenced a spirit of patriotic helpfulness that augurs well for the future of this Republic. It has brought assistance in thousands of cases of individual distress. In some of the northern cities arrangements were made for buying several hundred thousand bales of cotton at 10 cents a pound. In New York the business men organized a campaign for the purchase of 200,000 bales. In Chicago the business men organized a campaign for the purchase of 100,000 bales. In Baltimore an especial interest has been taken in this matter. I want to say here that in the city of Washington alone was the movement discouraged and repudiated—the city where

more money is expended that comes from the pockets of the southern people than perhaps any other city in the Union.

I wrote a letter to the Washington Chamber of Commerce and asked them to join this movement, to buy one bale of cotton, as an encouragement to the South in its great crisis; and here is the answer I received:

WASHINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
October 8, 1914.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors last night listened with much interest to the reading of your letter of 11th with regard to purchase of a bale of cotton by the chamber.

The board directed me to express its sincere regret that it could not see its way clear at present to make the purchase. With respect and esteem,

Sincerely, yours,

THOS. GRANT, Secretary.

Mr. President, it is no wonder that the city of Washington amounts to so little commercially in this Nation and that Baltimore is one of the important trading points of the South rather than the city of Washington. Baltimore is always responsive to every need of that section. I can not believe that the members of the chamber of commerce understood the real situation or that they understood what this movement meant.

I understand that my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON], the senior Senator from Texas, has had incorporated in the RECORD a telegram from the secretary of the State Senate of Texas, now in session, giving a resolution—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Before the Senator leaves the subject of this movement for buying a bale of cotton, I think it would be interesting if he would tell us just what the movement is. I should like to know, for instance, if it is undertaken in any community, how the cotton is stored and who has charge of it. Is there a committee or some one to whom the funds could be sent for that purpose?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes. The board of trade of almost any town or city in the South will buy a bale for anybody who desires it.

Mr. NORRIS. What is done with the bale of cotton?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The bale is stored in a warehouse, insured, and a warehouse receipt sent to the purchaser.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that, while there is a general knowledge of the movement, the details of it are not understood by the people, or I believe there would be a much greater response. For instance, anyone who wanted to help in that movement would not always know just where he should write, to whom he should remit the money, what arrangements have been made in regard to the storage and care of the cotton, where it would be kept, what would be the cost of keeping it, and all those details. I want to ask the Senator if they have been worked out and if there is some committee that has charge of the matter in the various localities, so that a person buying a bale of cotton would know in advance just what it was going to cost, what the storage was going to be, and whether responsible parties were going to have charge of it, so that it could be sold when the owner desired to sell it?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am very glad to say to the Senator that committees have been appointed in almost every locality in the South to take charge of the matter and to see to it that the people who buy cotton are properly cared for. I will say to him that periodicals, like the Literary Digest, the Saturday Evening Post, the Country Gentleman, Collier's, and other national publications are giving wide publicity to the movement and regard the whole measure favorably. I will state that special committees have been appointed to look after the matter in every State of the South.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is correct, that the majority of people do not understand how to go to work to purchase the cotton, and the representatives from the South should make the details of the matter known.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. LANE. A lot of people would be glad to support the movement and have a great deal of sympathy with it, but they do not know how it will work. They do not know how to proceed to purchase a bale of cotton or anything about how it will be taken care of or stored. It is all new to them. They are not familiar with cotton. They know nothing about raw cotton or baled cotton, for it is a new subject. The people out in our

part of the country are quite interested in the orange industry, and that is new to you. I think it is due that the facts should be made plain.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Nebraska does not understand me as complaining of any lack of sympathy for the movement.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. LANE. I did not understand that there was any such criticism made.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that the object I had in asking the question was to give publicity to that movement. It seems to me it is a very worthy movement, and I am satisfied people all over the country would be glad to take part in it, and I am not sure but that it might be the means, at least to a great extent, of solving the question. But the ordinary person who wanted or felt inclined to assist in the movement would not know perhaps what he ought to do, and when he did remit the money he would want to know, of course, that the cotton which was bought would be properly cared for, that responsible parties would have charge of it, and that after he had invested his money he would, in time, perhaps get it back.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall say to the Senator from Nebraska that general interest has already been expressed in the movement throughout the North. The suggestions of himself and the Senator from Oregon are very helpful, and as we proceed with the movement we will see to it that wider publicity is given and that the details are given wider advertisement.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator if he can not put into the Record such details as I have inquired about, not necessarily now, but within a day or two, giving the names and addresses of people to whom anyone desiring to assist might write, and also the modus operandi that would have to be gone through in order to get the cotton and how the cotton will be cared for and ultimately sold.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall be very glad to do so. I shall say that in the earliest infancy of the movement I organized a Buy a Bale of Cotton Club here in the Senate. I have here the original charter, and I should like to have it inserted in the Record, with the names of the signers. I think the organization of that club here gave a distinct impetus to the movement throughout the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

We hereby become members of the Buy a Bale of Cotton Club of the United States Senate, and we hereby agree that we will purchase, as soon as practicable, one or more bales of cotton for not less than 10 cents a pound, basis middling.

We hereby request the county judges in each county in the South, or such officers as fill similar positions in the counties where there are no county judges, to designate a chairman of a Buy a Bale of Cotton Club in each precinct.

The southern Members of the House of Representatives are requested to form a similar organization, and the governors and other State officers of the southern cotton States are asked to assist in any way they may deem advisable.

Bankers, merchants, business and professional men generally are especially requested to cooperate, and the help of the women of the South is especially desired.

The only requirement for membership in these clubs is the purchase of at least one bale of cotton for not less than 10 cents a pound for basis middling.

Morris Sheppard, Blair Lee, John Sharp Williams, Hoke Smith, Luke Lea, Joseph E. Ransdell, John K. Shields, Claude Swanson, Frank S. White, Duncan U. Fletcher, Albert B. Fall, William J. Stone, James Hamilton Lewis, J. R. Thornton, Joe T. Robinson, James K. Vardaman, N. P. Bryan, T. P. Gore, F. M. Simmons, J. H. Bankhead, W. E. Chilton, C. A. Culberson, W. S. West, James A. Reed, William H. Thompson, Robert L. Owen, James P. Clarke.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] has just said to me that he had never heard of that organization. I had never heard of it. I wondered if the Senator has given to it even here in the Senate the publicity that it deserves and which it ought to have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say to the Senator that the press handled the proposition and advertised it widely throughout the country, but only southern Members were asked to join the club here. That is the reason, perhaps, why the Senator had not heard of it before. We have not appealed to northern Senators as yet.

Mr. LANE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I think it would appeal to all Senators, but as the Senator knows, the newspapers are crowded with war news. The terrible struggle in Belgium detracts from other items of interest in the papers, and it is easy to overlook such a matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say that I now open the doors of the church and invite the Senator to join us. I shall be very glad to have Senators from Northern States as well as Southern States join the movement.

I was referring to the telegram which had been received from the Texas State Senate. I want to have it read, so that it may be a part of my remarks, although it has already been put in the Record this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the telegram will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., October 14, 1914.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following simple resolution by Senators Henderson and Gibson was to-day adopted by the Senate of Texas:

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we hereby endorse the amendment as proposed by the southern Senators and offered as an amendment to the war-tax bill, wherein it is proposed that the National Government issue \$250,000,000 of 4 per cent three-year bonds, and that said bonds shall be used to purchase 5,000,000 bales of this year's cotton, at 10 cents per pound, and providing that said cotton shall not be sold by the Government until 1916 and 1917, and that we hereby request the Congress of the United States to pass said amendment, and that a copy of this resolution be wired to our Senators, Hon. CHARLES A. CULBERSON and Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD."

W. V. HOWERTON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, to show what the Federal Government has been doing recently in behalf of certain sections of the country, I want to read an extract from an address delivered recently by Hon. John Skelton Williams, the brilliant and courteous Comptroller of the Currency, before the annual convention of the Indiana Bankers' Association a few days ago at Indianapolis, Ind. He said, in part:

Although this country had shipped abroad between May 1 and August 31, 1914, in payment of securities sold here for foreign account and in payment of debts due abroad, including balances due by importers, more than a hundred and sixteen million dollars of gold, the outbreak of the war found us with debts falling due in European countries between August 1 and January 1, 1915, amounting, as far as can be estimated, to between three hundred and four hundred million dollars. The largest portion of this indebtedness due by any one borrower was represented by the loans placed abroad of the city of New York, amounting to some \$82,000,000. Had the world been left at peace our exports of cotton, of food products, and other merchandise between August 1 and January 1, 1915, normally would have amounted to more than \$1,000,000,000, or enough to pay off the floating debt to Europe, to settle for all imports during the same period and show a handsome balance due us.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the exports of cotton alone have formed the chief bulwark of our gold payments abroad and of our balance of trade, and the fact that we are deprived of \$600,000,000 of gold with which we would discharge that indebtedness abroad this year makes this cotton problem a national problem and involves the whole Government, as well as the southern section. But to continue the quotation from Mr. Williams.

But when the 1st of August came, instead of launching our fleets of merchantmen laden with the fruits of our most bountiful harvests of cotton, wheat, and other merchandise, we faced the forbidden clouds of war suddenly gathered. All Europe seemed to rush to convert our securities, offering, as they did, better hope than any other for realization into gold, while all markets were closed against what we had to sell. It was necessary for us to seal our exchanges against our bonds and shares, as Europe had closed hers to our cotton, wheat, minerals, and manufactures. By this action one pressing and imminent danger was met and averted.

On Saturday, August 1, following the dumping upon the market for foreign account of an avalanche of bonds and shares held by foreigners, the reserves of the New York banks fell more than \$40,000,000 below legal requirements. The stock exchange had been closed, but the drain upon the resources of the New York banks had set in from many directions, and there was alarm and cause for it. Responding promptly to urgent appeals, the Secretary of the Treasury went over to New York Sunday afternoon, August 2, and held a conference that night with a score or more of the presidents of the leading banks and trust companies of the metropolis. He heard their statements, analyzed the situation quickly, saw what was necessary to enable the banks to meet the demands upon them and to restore confidence, which had been so racked by the world-shaking events of the week. Confidence in the Government, the people, and the ultimate resources of the country was absolute, but there was need to meet immediate and urgent emergency. Knowing that confidence and the soundness of the basis for it, the Secretary announced that the Government would supply the New York banks forthwith with as much as \$100,000,000 of additional currency if it should be needed. Anticipating the situation as it was laid before him at that conference, he had that Sunday morning, before leaving Washington, directed the shipment by express to the Subtreasury in New York for the New York banks of \$40,000,000, and the Treasury forces and the express companies at that moment were taxing their resources in hurrying the execution of the order.

The announcement that the Treasury had arranged to give the New York banks a hundred millions of currency was flashed that night over the wires to every section of the country, along with the assurance that the New York City banks were prepared to honor all requests of their country bank correspondents for shipments of currency against their balances. Therefore there was no suspension of currency payments or premium on currency as in the comparatively limited stringencies of 1893 and 1907.

A few weeks later leading bankers from New York came to Washington to ask if the Government would lend its support in enabling New York City to raise, through a syndicate of bankers, the funds necessary to provide for the city's loans of \$82,000,000 just maturing abroad.

There was no panic here, no actual distress here, no tremendous emergency. It was mere maturity of part of the debt of one of the municipalities of the United States. Continues Mr. Williams:

They were assured by the Secretary of the Treasury that the Government would cooperate by providing the banks with a further amount of currency and would accept a fair proportion of New York City's new notes or bonds as the basis for such currency, in order to help the bankers carry out the plan for the funding of the city's floating indebtedness; and since that time the Treasury Department has actually furnished to the New York banks \$50,000,000 of additional currency, making the total amount accorded to the banks of that city from the Treasury since August 1 more than \$140,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, if the Government could help a city of 5,000,000 people discharge its loans abroad by a direct transfer of \$50,000,000 of currency from the Treasury to a syndicate of that city's bankers, is it not reasonable for the cotton farmers, composing a majority of the people in one-third of this Republic, to request the Government for aid to the extent of \$250,000,000 in bonds, safely secured, when that aid involves no loss to the Government? You can not explain it to the cotton farmers of the South, and there is no explanation, unless it is that we have one mode of treatment for one section of the country and another mode for the other.

I have heard my generous and eloquent friend from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] say that if this emergency which is now destroying the South had occurred between Washington and New England, or between the Potomac River and the northern border of this country, steps would already have been taken to secure the necessary relief. This was said in no spirit of sectionalism, in no spirit of complaint. I repeat what has been done by the Government within the last 40 or 50 days to show that we are not without reason in making this request, to show that we do not deserve the criticism of the Senator from North Dakota, nor the criticisms made under their breath by some Senators and Representatives from our own section. There lies the trouble. If we could present a united front here, with every Member from our own section putting their efforts into the same proposition, we would have better prospect of success.

Mr. President, having already addressed the Senate on the subject of relief for the cotton growers of the South, I shall claim your attention for but a short time to-day. The pending amendment represents the combined judgment of a number of southern Senators who have been considering the matter at the several meetings they have recently held. I had the honor to participate in the conferences which developed this amendment, conferences at which not only the bill S. 6565, presented by me in the Senate, was discussed, but, in addition, practically all the measures that have been proposed in behalf of the cotton farmer. The result of these conferences is the pending amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. We have subordinated individual differences and individual opinions in an effort to reach the common ground represented by this amendment. We believe that it contains a plain and practical solution of the most terrible situation that has confronted the South since the war god smote her fields and firesides a half century ago.

The appeals that are coming in every mail to southern Senators and Representatives from their constituents are so freighted with tidings of disaster that we would be unworthy of our positions if we did not employ every possible means to secure relief, if we did not brave the criticisms such as those which have come from the Senator from North Dakota to-day.

If hostile fleets were bombarding southern ports, if invading armies were sweeping Southern States, the Nation would not hesitate to expend hundreds of millions of dollars—nay, to send millions of citizens, to her defense. The peril to the Nation as well as the South would be immediately recognized. And yet, the principal commodity of the South, the principal dependence of 21,000,000 of her people for subsistence, has been as completely bereft of value as if invading hordes had put the torch to 14,000,000 bales of cotton, reducing that fairest of all lands to poverty, her people to destitution. It is impossible for the Nation to avoid a share in this catastrophe if it be not modified or averted. If war in Europe could so fatally affect one-third of a Republic 4,000 miles away, separated from the arena of destruction by an ocean's width, how may the inhabitants of the other two-thirds of that Republic hope to escape the ruin that festers on their very borders.

The American people are now so closely knit by every tie of blood and interest that the woes of one section are the woes of all.

I say to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that if he ever comes here with a plea for his people he will

find me among those to support him; that it is no proper indictment of us to say that when his people suffered their representatives did not ask for relief.

The American people are united by the proudest memories that ever spurred a people to the path of glory. Theirs is the kinship of a common purpose, a common valor, a common sacrifice. They sought these shores to escape a common oppression to find a common liberty. Here they faced common dangers as they erected the foundations of a common freedom. A common impulse prompted them to revolution. When that struggle for their common rights began, the rattlesnake banner of South Carolina floated by the side of the pine-tree flag of Massachusetts. Northerners and southerners challenged a common death at Brandywine and Germantown and Saratoga. They shared the famine and the cold of Valley Forge. Together they charged at Monmouth and at Stony Point. They were comrades at Camden, at Kings Mountain, at Guilford Courthouse, at Eutaw Springs, at Yorktown. Again, their swords made common cause on Lake Champlain, Lake Erie, at Lundys Lane, at New Orleans. In the last-named conflict cotton bales were used for breastworks, and against them the hostile missiles poured in vain. What greater demonstration could be desired of the imperishable character of cotton, of the fact that the Government may safely purchase it as directed by this amendment. And with what added earnestness may we of the South appeal to the American Congress to save the staple that in a stressful hour saved this Republic! Again, sir, sons of North and South marched to common triumphs at Palo Alto, at Buena Vista, at Cerro Gordo, and Chapultepec. And though they turned their bayonets against each other in the sixties they made a common record of such valor, such loyalty, to principle, that it will shine on their posterity to the end of time, uniting this Republic forever. All of us here will recall how both sections were represented at Manila, at Santiago Bay, at Guantanamo, Las Guasimas, and San Juan Hill. To show that the common spirit still lives I need but point to the new-made graves in Northern and in Southern States of those who only a few months ago gave up their lives in a common sacrifice for their country at Vera Cruz. To-day there is not a citizen on the remotest coast of Maine for whom any Texan on the farthest windings of the Rio Grande would not die, if need be, in his defense.

Mr. President, is it too much to hope that such memories will prompt the American Congress to take such action as will save one-third of this Republic from economic disaster? We know what ruin means in the South; it is a land of Calvaries, of Gethsemanes. There is more of the cypress than the laurel in its crown. It has risen from the wreckage of the past to give the Union a devotion as unchanging as it is beautiful. It has contributed of its hard-earned substance without complaint to the support of the Federal Government, to the \$4,000,000,000 that have gone as pensions to the survivors of the northern armies, paying pensions at the same time to its own soldiers and their destitute widows as well out of its own means.

The Federal Government is the only agency sufficiently powerful to meet the emergency, and the plan we propose safeguards it against loss. If there has ever been or if there is ever to be an occasion in which the Nation should come to the aid of the South, that occasion now confronts us. If the Nation stays its hand in this crisis, the South will face the most desolate winter in 50 years, with the knowledge that a Government dedicated to brotherhood, hailed as a refuge of the oppressed, the richest and the strongest in the world, has heard its cries, but answered not. Well may the South then understand that she is in the Union, but not of it, not bone of its bone or blood of its blood.

I decline to believe that the Nation will assume this attitude toward the South. If Lincoln were in this Chamber to-day, his voice would be raised for this amendment, and from his great, sad heart would flow a tide of sympathy for his mother's land that would bring to it the Nation's aid, the Nation's prayers, the Nation's tears.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose.

Mr. JONES. What the Senator said is certainly very beautifully and well said. It may be that some one has already stated the real necessities of the situation in the South; but if so, I have not heard it. I want to consider this amendment in a sympathetic way, because if the people of the South are in the direful stress that the general statement would have us infer,

I would be perfectly willing to stretch a point—indeed, a good many points—to help them out. I was in hopes—

Mr. SHEPPARD. I went into the situation at some length some days ago, and I did not deem it necessary to repeat the details now. I will be very glad, however, to be more specific.

Mr. JONES. Of course the Senator knows how these statements are made when nothing is really pending; how, when there is no amendment pending, little attention is given to them. I have tried to be here pretty regularly; but I confess I missed the Senator's statement, and I have not had the time to read it. I was in hopes that the Senator would go into the details and point out really what the troubles are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state, also, Mr. President, that we had a hearing on this subject, and in that hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency the facts were detailed.

Mr. JONES. I am not a member of that committee, and I heard nothing of that testimony; I know nothing about what was said there. I will say that I am called upon to pass on this amendment without any information, except the general statement that there is a bad condition in the South relative to the cotton situation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did the Senator hear the speech of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] this morning?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry to say that I had to go to the department this morning on account of a previous engagement, and I did not get an opportunity to hear that speech.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then the Senator ought not to charge that we have dealt only in generalities.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I did not make that charge.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES. I was not making any charge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator is mistaken, then, when he says that only generalities have been advanced here to-day. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] went into details.

Mr. JONES. I was referring largely to the statements of the Senator from Texas. Of course, it was my misfortune that I could not be here to hear the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will suggest to the Senator from Washington that in the course of this discussion all those facts will be very fully brought out. As was stated by the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] gave a very exhaustive statement this morning descriptive of the conditions in the South, and it will appear in the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was on account of the fact that the Senator from Georgia had occupied the floor for an hour and a half to-day and described the situation fully that I confined myself to a general statement of the situation. I stated in my remarks also that having addressed the Senate last week I did not think it advisable to consume more time now by giving details. I thought the facts were generally understood.

Mr. JONES. Of course, there have been statements made about it, but the Senator, no doubt, appreciates the fact that aside from the situation in the South this is an important proposition, a proposition that involves a great many very important principles of government really, and we ought to be made thoroughly familiar with it by those pressing it. The conditions will bear repetition, as far as that is concerned, to justify legislation of this character. I will say, as I said a moment ago, I want to vote for this proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I appreciate the feeling of the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I am led to think that the situation is serious, but I want to know what it is, and I want to know of its seriousness. If its seriousness will justify it, I will vote for it even though I think it may violate some of the fundamental principles of our Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have a brief description of the situation right here that I will send to the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to make just this statement to the Senator from Washington, that if we do not convince him of the emergency, we will not expect his vote.

Mr. JONES. I want not only to be convinced of the emergency, but that this measure will take care of the emergency in a reasonable way; that the man who needs help will really get it. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator from Utah the floor? I wish to ask the Senator from Texas a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I have the floor, but I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. There is another question connected with this matter in which I am interested. I think we all sympathize with the conditions in which the South finds itself, and if it were a thing that we could readily or legally do I do not think that there would be very much opposition. But there are three questions involved in the proposition. The first is the question of policy, which I am not going to discuss. The second is our constitutional power to do what we are seeking to do. The third is the practical proposition with reference to the matter of legislation.

Now, the press carries this morning the news that the President will veto this measure. We are nearing the close of the session, and, of course, if it is vetoed it would not be passed over his veto. If we take it up for discussion, it will be here for the next seven or eight days, and there are some of us on this side who would like to know whether there is any authority for the publication of such a statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. None whatever, so far as I am informed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the statement? That the President would veto the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Gladly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is that the statement the Senator made a moment ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That the President would veto it?

Mr. BORAH. I say that is published in the press.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think anybody has the right to indulge the presumption that the President is going to do an improper thing until he does it.

Mr. BORAH. That should be true; but this is what the paper carries—

Mr. OVERMAN. What paper?

Mr. BORAH. The correspondent of the New York Sun from this city says:

It may be said on authority that if Congress incorporates an amendment in the war-revenue bill authorizing the issuance of bonds to be used in the purchase of cotton the measure will be vetoed by President Wilson. President Wilson also will veto any of the proposals made for the direct purchase of cotton or any other product or output of an industry that finds itself in distress as a result of the war in Europe.

That raises some perfectly legitimate questions. In view of the interview which was had by the Secretary of the Treasury the other day in regard to this matter, and in view of publications of this nature, it becomes of some importance for us to know whether, if we shall earnestly work out a proper plan with which to deal with this matter at this late hour in the session, there is any hope that we shall thereby accomplish anything?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I hope the Senator will not permit any rumored threat that the President may veto this measure or any opposition that may arise in this body or anywhere else to deter him from giving the South and the American people the benefit of his ripe experience and splendid intellect in the effort to work out the solution of this problem. I can not believe the President would think of vetoing a measure that does not violate the Constitution and which would give such widespread and much-needed relief to the whole country as this measure is intended to afford.

I want to say in this connection that this amendment, in my judgment, is crude; there are defects in it, some features of which I do not approve; but I hope that by the attrition of suggestions and by the friction of ideas the truth may be evolved and this threatened disaster averted. It is a question that should appeal to and command the best effort of our wisest and most patriotic statesmen. The spirit of sectionalism and hope for partisan advantage are out of place in this discussion. The loftiest patriotism and purest altruism should characterize our deliberations.

Permit me in this connection to say further, Mr. President, that I am sick and tired of the talk we hear in the Senate and on the streets of Washington to the effect that nothing dare be done by Congress until it has the O. K. of the White House. Such a reputation is very uncomplimentary to the Congress. I have as great respect for the President as has any man on this floor. He is a man of great learning and extraordinary force; he has also human limitations. But whatever his abilities or limitations may be, he has his function to perform as the President of the United States, while we have ours as the legislative department of the Government. The framers of the Government intended that the legislative department of the

Government should be the head of the Government, while the Executive was designed to be its hand. The former was to do the thinking, the latter the executing. I agree with the wisdom of the original plan. I think it altogether prudent to discuss with the President public questions, to listen to his advice with open mind; but the Congressman who makes himself the mere puppet to be moved by the presidential pull discredits the high place he holds and basely repudiates his first obligation to his constituents.

Mr. BORAH. I think that is sound doctrine, Mr. President, but I have been taught to respect the power of the President. I would not have raised this question upon the simple publication in one paper, although from so reliable a correspondent, but it has been floating out upon the political atmosphere for several days; and I merely should like to feel that while we are at work here, we shall not be working in vain. I am satisfied the situation is such that we can be made to know whether or not that is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator from Utah for a moment, if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to state to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the President of the United States has been known to change his mind. In fact, after an explicit declaration on the Panama Canal tolls matter, he changed his mind completely. He may change his mind about this matter if he finds there is any real equity and justice in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a proviso at the end of the amendment proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia the following:

Provided further, That whenever the price of copper in bars, ingots, or pigs shall fall below 10 cents per pound, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase all of the copper, in bars, ingots, or pigs offered for sale at said price. It shall be the duty of the said Secretary of the Treasury to store and hold said copper until it can be sold at a profit of 2 cents per pound.

The sum of \$50,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to meet the purchase price and the expenses of this provision.

To secure the necessary funds to carry out this purchasing project the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue bonds of the United States, bearing 4 per cent interest, in such denominations as he may determine, and due in three years from the date of issue; said bonds shall not be sold for less than par.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did we not pass a bill, which the Senator from Utah introduced a short time ago, for the purchase of a certain amount of silver?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate passed a bill which I introduced on August 24, 1914, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase not to exceed 15,000,000 ounces of silver, and for other purposes. That was to anticipate the wants of the Government; and no one doubts that the Government would use that amount of silver in its regular business within three years at the outside. Not only that, Mr. President, the bill did not direct the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the silver, but left it absolutely in his discretion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But, as a matter of fact, the bill would not have been thought of except for the unusual conditions prevailing in the country. Was it not the real purpose of the bill to help the condition of the owners of silver?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of it; and I want to say that I am very sorry the committee in the House has refused so far to report the bill to the House.

Mr. President, I am not going to ask for a vote on the amendment which I have proposed unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is adopted by the Senate. I wish to say to southern Senators that they can not picture a distressed condition in the South on account of the lack of a market for cotton any more distressing than could be pictured of the conditions in the West, and particularly in the States where copper is produced. I recognize, and did so when I introduced the bill authorizing the purchase of silver by the Secretary of the Treasury, that it was against all precedents. I stated at that time that conditions were distressing in the copper industry, but did not and was not intending to ask Congress to pass a bill for the relief of the producers of

copper. I believe all those who spoke in favor of the silver-purchase bill called attention to the conditions that existed in the West on account of the utter demoralization of the copper market.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah the number of States producing copper and the number of people engaged in its production.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the Statistical Abstract with me, but I will say that the principal States producing copper are Arizona, Michigan, Utah, Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, as well as most of the other western mining States.

Mr. FLETCHER. What number of people are engaged in its production?

Mr. SMOOT. Over 100,000 are so engaged, Mr. President. I will say that the amount of the exportations of copper alone for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, was 974,791,676 pounds, having a value of \$144,895,519.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not asked the question with any view of minimizing the importance of the industry at all, but for purposes of information. For the purpose of obtaining further information I desire to inquire whether or not copper is not being marketed at very good figures at the present time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the price of copper before the European war began was between 16 and 17 cents a pound. To-day the quotation is 10.30 in New York. I sent to New York this morning a telegram asking the price of copper there this morning, and the answer was that it was 10.30 bid; 10.40 asked. So the Senator from Florida can see the decrease in the price of copper, which, of course, has been brought about by the conditions existing in foreign countries.

I want also to say to the Senator from Florida that the producers of copper are in a worse condition than are the producers of cotton, by reason of the fact that we are not allowed to export copper in neutral bottoms to neutral countries. Great Britain has taken the position that we can not export it even to Holland, claiming that if it were exported to Holland it might in some way reach the German or Austrian Governments.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. VARDAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to ask under what rule of neutrality we are not permitted to export copper?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say I do not believe that there is such a rule, and I believe that such action is in violation of international law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It may be regarded as contraband.

Mr. SMOOT. But the British Government claims—

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the British Government claims it; but I do not care anything about what the British Government claims. I should like to have some better authority for prohibiting our exportation of that kind of stuff or of food products of any kind.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, to neutral countries?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not myself believe that there is any authority of international law for such a contention; but there is no question that the British Government is making that contention and will not allow foodstuffs to be shipped into neutral countries, where they think those foodstuffs will reach Germany or Austria; and that is true as to copper.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if England has made that suggestion—and we are heeding that suggestion—instead of walking in the light of the laws of neutrality we are violating those laws ourselves. We have a perfect right to ship food products or anything of that kind to any neutral nation; and the fact that they may incidentally get into some other nation or be utilized by some other nation that is at war has nothing to do with the general proposition.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Utah allow me to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to reply to the query of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. The same question came up last week as to the shipment of certain cottonseed products. Complaints came to the effect that England had refused to allow the shipment of cottonseed cakes into Holland on the ground that Holland, as a base, was being used as an

open door for the shipment of foodstuffs into Germany. I went to see the Secretary of State regarding it and was referred to the Solicitor, who informed me that the matter had been taken up with the British Government, and that the British Government had withdrawn any such intimation—there seems to have been some intimation to that effect—that Holland was considered a neutral country, and that all articles not contraband of war were being shipped freely into Holland over the Holland-American Steamship Line.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I said that cotton was in a better situation than copper, which is borne out by the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina. England has declared copper contraband of war. Of course that declaration applies to the exportation of copper to any of the belligerent countries; but they go further than that, and say that copper can not be shipped in neutral bottoms nor can it be shipped to neutral countries because of the fear that it will ultimately reach the hands of their enemy.

It is true—and I want to be perfectly frank with the Senate—that the British ambassador has made the statement that, so far as the British Government is concerned, if the neutral government will guarantee to England that the exports of copper to that neutral country will be for home or local consumption, the British Government will allow the copper to enter the neutral country. I understand that that was demanded of Holland before foodstuffs could be shipped into Holland from the United States.

I do not know how long, Mr. President, it is going to take the foreign countries to agree upon the proposition; I do not know whether they will agree or not; but if they would agree, so far as I am concerned, I can not see why there should be any particular objection on our part. England having declared copper contraband of war, but I say to the Senate now that—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMOOT. Gladly.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does not the Senator know that the copper production of this country is under the control of great trusts? The principal owners of copper are the Standard Oil Co. and the Amalgamated Copper Co. Does not the Senator also know that there is not \$50,000,000 worth of copper in existence in this country to-day? What he is complaining about is that they do not go on and dig more.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that the facts do not at all bear out the statement he has just made.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. In what respect do they fail to do so?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that, so far as most of the West is concerned, copper is produced by mine owners, and they are not members of any trust. The smelter buys ore from the producer. I think that is the case in every State in this Union that produces copper. The price of copper is, of course, fixed by the smelters, and the smelters fix the price upon the quotations of the New York market, which, in turn, are controlled by the foreign price.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am talking about the supply of existing copper. Does the Senator believe there is any such amount as \$50,000,000 worth of copper in existence in the United States to-day?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not say how much there is, but I want to say to the Senator that the production of copper—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Its value in 1912 was \$205,000,000, and we exported \$113,000,000 worth of it.

Mr. SMOOT. We exported \$140,000,000 worth of it last year.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. All the figures for last year have not been officially reported as yet in the regular Statistical Abstract.

Mr. SMOOT. I got my figures direct from the Treasury Department.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. What I wanted to ascertain was the condition about which the Senator is complaining in connection with the copper industry. Does he not complain of the fact that they have stopped digging copper, and that, therefore, those who formerly dug copper from the ground are not employed at this time?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly true.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is not the condition in the South. They have a crop ready to deliver.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, copper is produced from the ore in the ground into copper matte perhaps within 30 or 45 days. That is not the case with cotton. It takes a full year to produce cotton; but the men who are engaged in the production

of copper are out of employment and the man who has produced cotton has not a market to pay him for his cotton that has already been produced by his labor. Now, there is not a particle of difference as to the result; they are both hurt; they are both in distress, and conditions are such that—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with the Senator that they are both in distress. The Senator seems to think that the condition of the cotton grower is probably better, because, as he says, the cotton grower can sell the product of his toil. Well, as a matter of fact, the cotton grower has already expended more than the cotton will sell for at this time. If he sells it, he does not get enough for it to pay what he owes; he simply sacrifices it; he is compelled, as it were, to throw that away. There is no market; the laws of supply and demand for the time are suspended.

I agree with the Senator that where the Government can, without violating fundamental principles or doing violence to its polity or the genius of its construction, it should at all times go to the assistance of the citizen. If the Senator's proposition were in the same category as the proposition with reference to cotton, I would not hesitate to vote for it.

When a man comes here and asks the Government of the United States to lend him its credit in order to hold his cotton until the present abnormal condition shall change and the normal conditions be reestablished, and his proposition is so safe and sane that the Government shall not lose a cent by doing it, where we propose to levy a tax upon ourselves to pay the expense of carrying out this scheme, and where we, by levying a tax upon ourselves, indemnify the Government against every possible loss, I do not see—if it is not violative of the Constitution—I do not see why the Government should not lend its credit to the extent of \$250,000,000 in bonds.

I would be opposed to the measure if it taxed the Senator's constituents one dime. I do not think you are called upon to give the South a penny, but we are not here asking for assistance as mendicants; we are not begging. We are an integral part of this great Government, and I maintain that it is our right to invoke the aid of the Government to assist us in bridging this financial chasm by saving us from a sacrifice which will be not only disastrous to the South but hurtful to the entire country. The remainder of the Republic would not possibly suffer any loss if this amendment should be adopted.

I am in favor of levying a tax on the cotton of the South sufficient for the year 1915 to pay all the interest on the bonds and all the cost of maintaining or carrying out this plan, and I am in favor of following that by a tax for 1916 which will put it beyond the possibility of any cost to the General Government.

We are simply asking, Mr. President, this great and rich Government to lend us its functions, its great power, to save us from bankruptcy and to save the whole people from a tremendous loss. The only power beneath the blue canopy of heaven that can save the South from serious financial embarrassment is the Government of these United States. It is a case of "Help me, Cassius, or I sink." And I trust the Congress will not refuse us the helping, saving hand.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator knew the situation as it really exists in the West, he would not have made the statement that conditions there are different from those in the South. The emergency exists in both cases; they are upon all fours. The proposition with you is that you can not sell your cotton under present conditions, and with us that we can not sell our copper.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the Senator, to be perfectly fair and keep the parallel, ought to keep in mind this very vital difference: We have on hand, already produced, the entire output of a year from the cotton fields, amounting last year in value to a billion dollars, and under normal conditions worth this year a billion dollars. While you are pleading, not for that which is already produced but for the privilege of going on and keeping men employed in producing it, we have come here and asked the Government to help take care of what we have already produced. The article is now between the bagging and the ties, and the merchants and the producers are asking the Government to help them distribute what has already been made during the period of a year in order that we can come out without a loss, rather than asking them to valorize it and

let us go on and produce more. That is the characteristic difference.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield in a moment. The Senator's argument would be true if the South were going to stop raising cotton; but it is not going to stop. The South is going to plant cotton this year, and there is no difference between planting cotton now for next year's crop and producing cotton now for a future market—not a particle. Not only that, but I will say to the Senator that if it were known in all the world that no cotton would be produced in the Southern States next year, nobody would have any trouble in selling the cotton now on hand; and not only that, but if the boards of trade of the great centers were open I do not believe that you would have very much trouble in selling cotton, because there would be immense speculation in it. So it comes right back to the one question of sale, and whether the commodity be produced this month for a future market or next year for a future market makes no difference. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from South Carolina what I was going to ask the Senator from Georgia a few moments ago, and that is, Does the Senator believe, if this measure passes Congress, it will become a law?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Emphatically I do.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator take any stock in the proposition that the President would veto the bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Not this bill; I do not believe he would. I want to repeat right in this connection, Mr. President, to the Senator from Idaho, that I believe if Congress—the House and the Senate—realized, as they seem now to be realizing, the far-reaching effect of the absolute tie-up of a billion dollars, the far-reaching effect in the commercial world that the lack of the sale of our cotton crop is producing, they would take steps to relieve the situation.

On the very point that the Senator from Utah mentioned a moment ago—that the world will not now even pay the value of the cotton they must have, because they are afraid that a large crop will be planted next year—I will say that the tax in this bill will act as a deterrent in that respect. I had a telegram not more than an hour ago from a member of the State Legislature of South Carolina, from the chairman of the committee on the cotton congress, saying that the probabilities were that the bill for the total elimination of cotton planting in South Carolina would pass before next week, showing that the people in the cotton-growing States are thoroughly aroused to the seriousness and the disaster that confronts them. With the banks tied up, with the merchants tied up, and the effect of the loss of a billion-dollar crop reaching throughout the whole commercial world of America, I believe that if Congress will authorize the issuance of bonds it will tide us temporarily over this disastrous condition and bring about the very condition the Senator from Utah mentioned a moment ago, namely, that the crop of this year will not be duplicated next year, and we will have no difficulty then in financing it. That is precisely what we are trying to do now, and I do not believe that the President of the United States or any other patriot would step in and perpetuate the condition that is confronting the whole American people and threatening to bring disaster and ruin to the South.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is an open secret everywhere that the President is thoroughly opposed to this amendment, and that he will veto the bill if it passes with this amendment in it; and that is one of the things I want to be satisfied on if I can. I am glad to have that assurance from the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I was one of the southern Senators who met with the Senator from Georgia, who is now on the floor, for the purpose of drafting this amendment, and I have not heard of a single member of that conference who has spoken of it to the President; and if he has given any utterance in reference to this amendment I have not heard it. I think that is totally gratuitous, unless some newspaper reporter may have had some means of communication that we have not availed ourselves of.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator from Utah under what provision of the Constitution of the United States he offers his amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not offer it under any provision of the Constitution of the United States, and in my opening statement I remarked that I did not propose to ask for a vote upon the amendment unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I take it, then, that the Senator from Utah was of the opinion that one bad precedent deserved another.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah took the position that if a condition exists in the South that requires the passage of legislation of this kind, certainly the conditions in the West require the same kind of legislation.

Mr. BORAH. I presume, as a mere question of policy, that would be true.

Mr. SMOOT. And I thought it ought to come at the same identical time.

Mr. BORAH. There is no doubt that the policy of the Senator is justifiable, and can be defended; but does not the Senator think that before this law could be put into effect in all probability somebody would have to meet the constitutional question, and somebody would have courage enough to do it?

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, and I will frankly admit it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. LANE. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question, with the permission of the Senator from Utah. I understood him to say that the legislature in his State will pass a bill prohibiting altogether the planting of cotton next year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was stated in a telegram I received from the president of the cotton congress.

Mr. LANE. I understand it is the intention throughout the South to curtail the planting of cotton. In the event that the cotton States do prohibit or discourage the planting of cotton, I should like to ask what provision they are going to make for the employment and the sustenance of the people who are engaged in gathering and handling cotton? Will not that create another emergency there, and will not some provision have to be made for them? Will not that bring disaster upon a lot of other people later on—next year, for instance?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I spoke a moment ago of this bill for the total elimination of cotton planting as showing to what extent the people of that section realize the disaster confronting them. I myself know that there will be enforced reductions. I believe it will be better to have legal reductions, to bind it so that this disaster will not take place again; but I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the farmers of the South, with every encouragement, planted and made this crop. With the conditions that have precipitated this disaster still continuing, you may rest assured that next year they will engage in raising foodstuffs, and engage in other occupations that will not lead to a repetition of the condition in which they find themselves. In the meantime, however, they are just asking that they may be tided over until such time as this world-wide necessity—for that is what cotton is—can be sold for its true value. Cotton does not go into the same category with any other article.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I understood the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], there is a provision in it that in case the cotton that is purchased by the United States should not pay the bonds, the interest and other payments are to be secured upon the crop of the next year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And the crop of the year after that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Now, if you do not raise any crop next year, what security does the Government have?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, it may be that South Carolina will cut off the production entirely, but it is absolutely certain that the majority of the States will not do so.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then we add a tax in 1916 and a tax in 1917 for that purpose. The proposed extreme curtailment in South Carolina has application alone to South Carolina, and alone to next year's crop. There is no thought in my own State of abandoning the planting of cotton next year. I think it would be a great national and world-wide misfortune if the South should entirely abandon the planting of cotton—a misfortune to the South and a misfortune to the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that if the Government issues these bonds at the rate of 10 cents a pound he may rest assured that if we totally eliminate the planting of cotton next year the Government will suffer no loss, because the five millions she has will bring more than what she puts into them, and a tax will not be necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is not any doubt about that. If that were done, cotton would sell for over 15 cents a pound, and the Government would make a handsome profit.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from South Carolina would not advise that policy generally as to production throughout the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not, unless it were proved between now and the time next year when we would normally plant our cotton that the dropping off of exportations had continued as it is going on now. We have made enough this year to supply the world for two years in that event.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I mean the Senator would not advise the application of that principle to other crops than cotton. We have laws on the statute books prohibiting combinations in restraint of trade and combinations that seek to limit production, and yet, if I understand the Senator correctly—and I have understood it from other sources—the proposition here is to limit, by agreement—and the Senator would have it by law—the production of a great staple necessity, according to the statement that has been made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Utah will allow me to reply in a word, I think the affirmative always carries the negative, and I think if we have laws here to prohibit disaster from restraint of trade we ought to have common sense enough and patriotism enough to avert disaster, if possible, by promoting trade; and that is what we are doing here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think this little side discussion has brought out the fact that both the South and the West are suffering because of a lack of a market for their principal products, and I do not believe there is any difference whatever between one case and the other. We both lack a market, and we both have to produce the products for sale. Therefore I shall not spend any more time upon that question.

The Senator from Mississippi referred to the levying of a tax by the Government of the United States upon the cotton produced in the South. I do not profess to be a constitutional lawyer, but I do not believe the Government of the United States can levy a tax upon cotton produced in the South; I do not believe the Government of the United States can levy a tax upon the copper produced in the West, or the production of any article in any part of this country. That, however, is a matter for consideration when we get to the consideration of this amendment. I do believe that if the amendment offered becomes a part of the bill, and the imposition of a tax on cotton production is a part of the act, it will be declared unconstitutional. I do not believe the Government of the United States has that power.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A tax was levied directly on cotton, and \$68,000,000 is now in the Treasury, derived from it, that never has been paid out.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that conditions were quite different at the time of the imposition of that tax than they are to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Supreme Court was equally divided upon whether it was constitutional or unconstitutional—4 to 4.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt but that if that question were resubmitted to the Supreme Court of the United States to-day it would be unanimously against the proposition.

As I read the Senator's amendment, its real object is to regulate the price of cotton at the present time. We are not asking, in the amendment I propose, that a price shall be paid for copper that is more than the market price, even under the circumstances existing to-day. The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that we are placing a price upon cotton nearly 70 per cent, and, in fact, I suppose 100 per cent, from what the Senator has said, above the market value of the cotton to-day; that is, I mean the market price of the cotton, not the value of it, because I believe that cotton anywhere in the world under normal conditions to-day would be worth 10 cents a pound. Therefore the value of it is 10 cents a pound, but the market price of it is only about half that value.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate just now to discuss this question further. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is accepted, then I will have a little more to say about my amendment.

I want to say to the Senator, also, that we can not eat copper any more than the people of the South can eat cotton. We can not live on it any more than the people of the South can live on cotton; so, as far as the two products are concerned, every condition is identical. The condition is that hundreds and thousands of our people are out of employment, and the industry is almost paralyzed.

I want, also, to give credit to the men who are buying the ore from the mines that are still in operation. They are carrying the load just as far as it is possible for them to secure money from any source in the United States to do it. The smelters are doing everything they can to continue operations, and intend to do so as long as there is a chance for them to secure money from the regular channels of trade to pay for the ore that is being mined at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NORRIS in the chair). The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment of the committee passed over is on page 3, where the committee proposes to strike out section 2 as printed in the House bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, in the language of the court, "where we are at." Are we on the main bill now, or are we on the cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on a committee amendment that was passed over.

Mr. BORAH. Not the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. The Chair is informed that there was a unanimous-consent agreement that the committee amendments should have the first consideration, and there are some committee amendments undisposed of.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, on page 3, line 1, after the words "United States," on behalf of the committee I desire to offer an amendment. In the first place, I move to reconsider the committee amendment that has been already agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on that page was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 3 of the Senate print, after the words "United States," I move to strike out the balance of that section and to insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning after the words "United States," on line 1 and ending on line 5 with the words "Secretary of the Treasury," and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That for the purpose of this act rectified distilled spirits shall be construed to be the product obtained by rectification as defined by section 3244, Revised Statutes, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided further*, That the additional tax imposed by this section shall be paid by appropriate stamps prepared, affixed, and canceled in such manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator from Utah that that is an amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is a very good amendment; but why strike out the word "furnished" and use the word "affixed" in the proviso?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know, except that that is the suggestion of the department. This proviso seems to have been badly drawn originally.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, without looking up the question, that I take it for granted that the word "furnished" is not necessary, because under the law I suppose that would be done anyhow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the committee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. On the same page the committee proposes to strike out all of section 2 as printed in the House bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, for that I offer as a substitute the matter which I send to the desk. I want to say that I think there is one slight amendment that should be made to this long amendment; but in the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who had this matter in charge, I do not desire to make the change. I will offer the substitute as a whole, and then hereafter that amendment can be made.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator offers this as a substitute for the committee amendment found in section 3, as I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is offered, as the Chair understands, as a substitute for section 2.

Mr. SIMMONS. It should be section 3.

Mr. SMOOT. It should be section 3, because section 3 was a substitute by the committee for section 2.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to withdraw that amendment for the present. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] tells me that the Senator from Missouri has asked that it go over for the present.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to say that as a result of an informal conference we had a little while ago I was going to suggest that that matter go over to the end of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to section 2, on page 3. That is one committee amendment that has not yet been passed on.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the wine amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment commencing with line 6, on page 3, and striking out the balance of the page. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to have that postponed now?

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to substitute for that the amendment that I just sent to the desk and withdrew. I think that can go over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 10, line 8, after the word "sales," I move to insert the words "or transfers"; on the same page, line 10, after the word "sales," I move to insert the words "or transfers"; on the same page, line 12, after the word "sales," I move to insert the words "or transfers"; and on the same page, line 14, after the word "sales," I move to insert the words "or transfers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 8, in the House text, after the words "annual sales," it is proposed to insert the words "or transfers"; on line 10, after the word "sales," it is proposed to insert the words "or transfers"; on line 12, after the word "sales," it is proposed to insert the words "or transfers"; and on line 14, after the word "sales," it is proposed to insert the words "or transfers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have here some amendments that relate to Schedule B of the bill. I will offer an amendment to page 42, and then I will go back and offer amendments to other sections of the bill that will be affected by striking out the part that I propose to strike out on page 42.

I move to strike out, on page 42, beginning with line 15, all down to and including line 2 on page 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In Schedule B, on page 42, beginning on line 15, it is proposed to strike out all of the proposed committee amendment down to and including line 2 on page 44, in the following words:

Medicinal proprietary articles and preparations: For and upon every packet, box, bottle, pot, or phial, or other inclosure, containing any pills, powders, tinctures, troches or lozenges, sirups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters (except natural spring waters and carbonated or fortified natural spring waters), essences, spirits, oils, and all medicinal preparations or compositions whatsoever, made and sold, or removed for sale, by any person or persons whatever, wherein the person making or preparing the same has or claims to have any private formula, secret, or occult art for the making or preparing the same, or has or claims to have any exclusive right or title to the making or preparing the same, or which are prepared, uttered, vended, or exposed for sale under any letters patent, or trade-mark, or which, if prepared by any formula, published or unpublished, are held out or recommended to the public by the makers, venders, or proprietors thereof as proprietary medicines, or medicinal proprietary articles or preparations, or as remedies or specifics for any disease, or diseases, or affection whatever affecting the human or animal body, as follows: Where such packet, box, bottle, pot, phial, or other inclosure, with its contents, shall not exceed, at the retail price or value, the sum of 5 cents, one-eighth of 1 cent.

Where such packet, box, bottle, pot, phial, or other inclosure, with its contents, shall exceed the retail price or value of 5 cents and shall not exceed at the retail price or value the sum of 10 cents, two-eighths of 1 cent.

Where such packet, box, bottle, pot, phial, or other inclosure, with its contents, shall exceed the retail price or value of 10 cents and shall not exceed at the retail price or value the sum of 15 cents, three-eighths of 1 cent.

Where each packet, box, bottle, pot, phial, or other inclosure, with its contents, shall exceed the retail price or value of 15 cents and shall not exceed the retail price or value of 25 cents, five-eighths of 1 cent. And for each additional 25 cents of retail price or value or fractional part thereof in excess of 25 cents, five-eighths of 1 cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, does not that schedule relate to the committee amendment found on page 13?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; there are quite a number of amendments that I will offer to make the bill conform to this elimination if it is made.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator now moves to strike out the matter indicated by him and proposes to return to this for the same purpose later on?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not yet understand what the amendment is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the amendment.

The Secretary again stated the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is the provision of the bill with reference to proprietary articles.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There certainly can be no objection to striking that item out of the bill. It never should have been in the bill at all, and to strike it out does what we have all anticipated might be done by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me understand what the Chair means by the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment originally began in line 15, on page 42, and extended over to and including line 19, on page 46.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is as I understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to that committee amendment, to strike out, beginning with line 15, on page 42, and going over to and including line 2, on page 44, has been agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Now, I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he intends to offer any further amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. Not to that particular amendment, but I propose to offer quite a number of amendments as to related things in the bill; that is, things that have been placed in the bill since we have stricken out the provision as to proprietary medicines.

Mr. SMOOT. What I meant was, does the Senator intend to make any change in sparkling or other wines which are included in the committee amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I have no amendment as to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Just one moment, Mr. President. [After a pause.] I thought I had an amendment to that particular part of the amendment, but I find I have not, and therefore I have no objection to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 13, line 4—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the paragraph, beginning in line 3 and including line 9? Let me see if we understand one another. It reads:

And there shall also be levied, collected, and paid, for and in respect to the medicines, preparations, matters, and things mentioned and described in Schedule B of this act, manufactured, sold, or removed for sale—

And so forth.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to have the word "medicines," in line 4, stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is that all the Senator wishes to have stricken out?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator let us know what that accomplishes?

Mr. SIMMONS. That would leave the other language with reference to cosmetics and perfumery and chewing gum. I wish to strike out the word "medicines," because that applies to the part we have stricken out of Schedule B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 4, in the proposed committee amendment, strike out the word "medicines" and the comma after the word.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 16, I move to strike out all beginning with line 22 down to and including the words "said stamp," in line 9, page 17, and to insert:

That instead of cancellation by initials and date the stamps on the articles enumerated in Schedule B.

The words "shall be" immediately follow.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not understand that.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is just a continuation. The balance of the paragraph remains the same.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The amendment to the amendment comes in before the word "shall," in line 9, on page 17?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; before the word "shall."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 17, line 14, I move to strike out—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that that is a part of the amendment just agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I ask that it be reconsidered. I have another amendment to offer to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the vote agreeing to the amendment as amended will be reconsidered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move to strike out all on page 17, after line 14, and all on page 18, down to and including line 6. The matter I propose to strike out begins with the words, "Any person who shall fraudulently obtain or use any of the aforesaid stamps or designs therefor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. In the amendment I understand that all penalties are included.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; as to those particular stamps. The stamps we are referring to now, the Senator will see, are where the dies from which they are printed are in the department, so that the department impresses those dies upon the stamp. It is a patented article, and they have some trade-mark. The penalty provision only applies to that character of stamps. If the Senator will turn back, he will see in another part of the bill the penalties are imposed with respect to all other kinds of stamps.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 25, line 18, I move to strike out the word "medicine" and the comma and insert in lieu thereof the words "perfumery, cosmetics," and, in line 19, to strike out the words "including perfumery and cosmetics." That is merely transposing the language.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 26, line 1, after the word "could," I move to strike out the balance of the paragraph, striking out the proviso beginning on line 1 and ending on line 16.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 34, line 21, I move to strike out all after the word "offense" down to and including the word "aforesaid," in line 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 31, line 21, after the word "cents," I move to insert:

Provided, That it is not intended by this act to impose a tax upon an agreement evidencing a deposit of stock certificates as collateral security for money loaned thereon, which stock certificates are not actually sold, nor upon such stock certificates so deposited.

And to strike out the word "*Provided*," in line 21, and insert "*And provided further*."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] has an amendment which he desires to offer to this part of the bill.

Mr. SHIVELY. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it a committee amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. The committee accepts the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 34 of the bill, line 14, after the word "*Provided*," strike out all down to and including the word "shipment," in line 17, and insert:

That a consignment of newspapers to any one point or to different points by the same train or conveyance when inclosed in one general bundle at the point of shipment shall be considered as one shipment, and in lieu of a bill of lading therefor the publisher of such newspaper shall file, on or before the 15th day of each month with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which such newspaper is published, a report, under oath, showing the number of such shipments during the preceding month, to which report such publisher shall affix and cancel stamps equal in value to 1 cent for each shipment so reported: *Provided further*, That the report herein required shall not in-

clude shipments of newspapers delivered to points within the county in which the same are published.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 33, line 22, after the word "court," I move to strike out the period and to insert:

That no bill, memorandum, agreement, or other evidence of such sale, or agreement of sale, or agreement to sell, in case of products or merchandise actually delivered to, and while in vessel, boat, or car, and actually in course of transportation, shall be subject to this tax, provided such bill, memorandum, agreement, or other evidence of such sale, or agreement of sale, or agreement to sell shall be accompanied by bills of lading or vouchers showing that the said products are actually in course of transportation as aforesaid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 39, line 3, after the word "Insurance," I move to strike out the words in parentheses "(marine, inland, fire)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On the same page, in line 20, after the words "mutual fire insurance companies," I move to insert the words "or associations."

Mr. SMOOT. Is not the word "association" pretty broad? Should it not be reciprocal associations?

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not catch the point.

Mr. SMOOT. I was wondering whether the word "association" is not too broad. Ought it not to apply only to reciprocal associations?

Mr. SIMMONS. That means purely cooperative associations.

Mr. THOMAS. The committee uses that word because of some correspondence which it had from one or two sources calling its attention to a number of aggregations, so to speak, of individuals operating sometimes as a sort of joint-stock concern, sometimes as a sort of partnership, and sometimes as an association. To designate each of them would be somewhat cumbersome, and after consulting the dictionary we felt that the word used alone would perhaps cover all these several different sources of aggregations, mutual in their character.

Mr. SMOOT. All I desire is to see that the reciprocal associations are taken care of in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I think there is no doubt that the word covers it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was our opinion.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator thinks that covers it, I am satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would explain why an exception is made in favor of purely cooperative or mutual insurance companies. I have received a number of protests against that proposition, and the basis of the argument that has been made is that many of the other companies which provide that all the profits shall be divided among those holding policies are in exactly the same position as these mutual companies; and yet they are to be taxed, while the mutual companies are to be relieved from taxation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the Senator noted the fact that the companies relieved here are limited to such as are carrying on business without any profit?

Mr. McCUMBER. If the profits, or what would properly be profits, are placed in an account, which account is to be shared in pro rata by those holding policies, why should a company of that kind be compelled to pay taxes while the other mutual companies of the same character should not pay them?

Mr. SIMMONS. The word "profits" is the dividing line, as the committee thought. It is called a mutual company, or co-operative company, and is doing business upon that line; but if there is a profit realized, all the stockholders ought to pay the tax. If it is mutual in the sense that each one of the members of the association contributes his part toward any loss that may be sustained and there is no surplus for division, we thought that would come within the line of institutions we have habitually in all these bills exempted.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would the Senator contend that in the case I have mentioned such a company would be free from taxation, where the only profits would not go to stockholders, but simply, after paying the expenses and the salaries, go entirely to a fund to be divided among the holders of insurance certificates?

Mr. SIMMONS. I should think it would not be a company for profit if the only sum collected in excess of what was necessary to pay the losses was that necessary to keep up the organization and some fund provided for some other purpose in

connection with a possible future loss. I should think that was not conducted for profit.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not looked very far into it, but I know there is a great deal of opposition to such a provision.

Mr. SIMMONS. However, I think the class of corporations the committee had in mind were corporations that assess the members no larger sum than is actually necessary to pay the losses and to pay the legitimate expenses of keeping up the organization.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I think the Senator is right with regard to that, but I do not see why an association of that kind should not stamp its premiums just as well as the ordinary stock company. Both of them pay profits, but in one case the profits are returned to the policyholders and in the other they go to the stockholders. The policyholders in the case of the mutual company take the risk of insuring the property of each other. Some of these mutual companies have a very large business, and by reason of the mutuality of their business they are enabled to insure each other at very much less than the ordinary insurance rates, and in many cases return a large part of the premiums to their policyholders at the end of the year. It is purely a business proposition; there is nothing philanthropic about it; they are not charitable associations; they have profits, but the profits they receive are in the shape of a lower cost of insurance upon their properties. There is no reason in the world, it seems to me, why they should be relieved from taxation any more than should the ordinary stock company.

It must be remembered that the cost of this taxation does not fall upon the insurance companies; that it goes back to the policyholders in the end, in the stock companies as well as in the mutual companies. I do not see any reason at all for excepting the mutual companies from taxation in this case. I think that the bill should be amended so as to include all policies of insurance, if we are going to tax any.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the proviso under discussion appears in the revenue act of 1898. It has been followed by the committee only so far as is necessary to cover similar enterprises of a mutual character that are instituted and carried on solely for the protection of the property of the members, and not for profit.

A stock company may, in its general practices, be mutual in its character, but it is nevertheless a stock company. If there be profit, the profit is declared and paid through the medium of stock ownership. Such companies as the Senator from Pennsylvania has suggested, even though they are mutual, are still taxable, notwithstanding this proviso, if they are mutual concerns for profit and if a profit is made and distributed among the members. It is only those which are solely for protection, and not for profit, that are exempted, either as to the proviso embodied in the bill from the act of 1898 or as to the amendment which the committee has inserted in the bill.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THOMAS. With pleasure.

Mr. OLIVER. I will ask the Senator if he does not acknowledge that in the end this tax will fall upon the policyholders in both cases?

Mr. THOMAS. I think so.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, why relieve the mutual policyholder when you do not relieve the policyholder in the other case?

Mr. THOMAS. We do not relieve the policyholder in the other case unless he makes a profit. If he makes a profit, he must pay the tax. If he does not make a profit, of course he will be within the exemption.

Mr. OLIVER. I can not see the distinction. In one case you charge the policyholder who insures in a regular company with the tax—for it lands on him eventually—and in the other case you relieve the man who joins with a hundred or a thousand other people to mutually insure each other's property.

Mr. THOMAS. It lies in the matter of profit. If that does not exist, of course there is no reason for the distinction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 40, line 1, after the word "insurance," I move to strike out the parentheses and the words "casualty, fidelity, and guaranty."

Mr. SMOOT. Before that amendment is agreed to, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there will be two paragraphs headed "Insurance," and in the index of the bill, when made, it will be very hard to ascertain just what it is. It does seem to me that one of the headings ought to be

changed. I think the latter clause ought to be headed: "Insurance, fidelity and guaranty."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask that the first word in the line, "insurance," and the colon before the word "each" be stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. Also let the semicolon go out, and make this part one paragraph, as I then it will be complete.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 40, line 8, after the word "inland," I move to strike out the word "and" after the word "fire," and to insert a comma, and also to strike out the word "insurance," and to insert:

Personal, accident, health, and workmen's compensation insurance carried on by the members thereof solely for their own protection and not for profit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the word "and," where it appears before the word "fire," and after the word "fire" to insert a comma, and also to strike out the word "insurance," in the same line, and to insert:

Personal, accident, health, and workmen's compensation insurance carried on by the members thereof solely for their own protection and not for profit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina what class of insurance is now to be caught by this dragnet?

Mr. SIMMONS. This has reference to policies of insurance on bonds or obligations in the nature of indemnity for loss, damage, or liability, issued or executed or renewed by any person, association, or corporation, and so on. It will include a very large class of insurance.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Would it extend to bonds which are issued to guarantee the Government against misfeasance in office?

Mr. SIMMONS. Those would be included.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under what terms? I had very much hoped that they would not be included.

Mr. SIMMONS. It includes:

Each policy of insurance or bond or obligation of the nature of indemnity for loss, damage, or liability, issued or executed—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator think that ought to be included?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not see any reason why a policy of that kind should not pay the tax.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not think that class should pay.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a bond given for the fidelity of the official.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not think any of that class of contracts ought to be taxed.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is a matter of policy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think it is very unfortunate that it is done. I am especially sorry that it is proposed to lay the hand of the Government upon any contract of this nature for the purpose of getting revenue.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is exactly the old law, I will say to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly, if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was recognized by the Chair and remained standing.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, of course, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina in charge of the bill if the amendment which he has just offered will eliminate from the possibility of taxation any form of cooperative insurance conducted for the benefit of the members without the possibility or the intention of making a profit?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would not like to have to answer offhand a question of that sort. It would be a matter of construction.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the Senator from North Carolina another question. There is a form of insurance known as the Navy mutual aid insurance. It is cooperative insurance, under which the naval officers who belong to the association pay dues, and after their death their families receive, I think, \$3,000. Would such insurance be covered by this provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The taxation of all life insurance has been stricken from the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the exceptions are life insurance, marine insurance, inland insurance, and fire insurance. This is a different class of insurance. Then there is added to those exceptions personal, accident, health, and workmen's compensation insurance. I think the insurance about which the Senator from Massachusetts is talking would have reference to life insurance, which we struck out altogether.

Mr. WEEKS. Has that been stricken out altogether?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; that was stricken out several days ago when the bill was under consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if the effect of the amendment which he has just offered would not be to include life insurance as well as all of the other varieties of insurance named, except when they are cooperative mutual associations, not for profit? The Senator has inserted that clause as qualifying all of these various kinds of insurance, and the effect of that would be to make life insurance taxable, it seems to me.

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; there is no term in this section which could possibly be so construed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator read the clause in parentheses as amended by the amendment just adopted?

Mr. SIMMONS. The clause as it is now written in the bill is "except life, marine, inland, and fire insurance."

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is not all. As I understand, the Senator has not read it all. He added as an amendment some words to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will read it all. As the bill is written it excepts life, marine, inland, and fire insurance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, we have added to those exceptions "personal, accident, health, and workmen's compensation insurance."

Mr. POINDEXTER. But, Mr. President, in order to get the effect of that provision you have to read it all together. If the Senator from North Carolina will read the amendment as amended, he will see what the effect of it will be.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will do that, if the Senator desires me to do so. It would read:

Except life, marine, inland, fire, personal, accident, health, and workmen's compensation insurance, carried on by the members thereof solely for their own protection, and not for profit.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Now, the Senator must see, from what he has just read, that that would subject life insurance to taxation in all of those cases where the business is not carried on solely for their own protection and not for profit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The word "life" ought to go out.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the word "life" ought to go out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Having stricken life insurance out of the bill, we also ought to strike this language out.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator is right, that the word "life" ought to go out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the intention of the Senator was to do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask to modify the amendment in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he intends to exempt life insurance from taxation?

Mr. SIMMONS. We have done that. We have eliminated from the bill the entire section with reference to life insurance.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I had overlooked the fact that we eliminated that.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will turn back to page 38, he will see a provision there for life insurance, but by an amendment, agreed to when this bill was previously under consideration, that section of the House bill was eliminated.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from North Carolina. As the bill was reported from the committee, in the parentheses which the Senator has just moved to amend, not only life but marine, inland, and fire insurance are excepted from the effects of the paragraph.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is it the Senator's intention to include marine, inland, and fire insurance in the provision and make them subject to taxation except where the companies issuing the policies are mutual and not conducted for profit?

Mr. SIMMONS. No.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the effect of the amendment which the Senator has proposed.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will see that on the preceding page we have provided for marine, inland, and fire insurance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the very reason, it seems to me, they ought not to be included in this paragraph. The effect of the Senator's amendment is to include them except where such companies are mutual and not conducted for profit.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the effect is to except them, not to include them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. When the Senator inserts an exception of a specific variety of insurance, which is mutual and not for profit, he necessarily includes all those that are for profit.

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; what this section was intended to do was to except from the operation of this particular paragraph marine, inland, fire, and workmen's compensation insurance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, I thought that was the Senator's intention; but that is not the effect of the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator has just admitted that the amendment which he offered would include life insurance, and for the same reason it would include all these other kinds of insurance.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator uses the word "include" in a different sense from that in which I use it. I use it as meaning that it would include fire, marine, and other insurance in the exception clause of the paragraph. Life insurance has been stricken out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What kind of insurance does the Senator mean to qualify by the phrase "mutual and not for profit"?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will carefully read that paragraph, I think he will see what kind. We intended to include workmen's compensation insurance. This exception as now framed by the amendment would have reference to things that might be covered under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that he would carry out his meaning if he would say "except life, marine, inland, and fire insurance of any kind whatever, and workmen's compensation insurance where the company is not conducted for profit, but solely for mutual protection."

Mr. TOWNSEND. Or if the Senator would leave it as it is in the parentheses—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I understand the Senator correctly, the object he has in mind would be carried out by leaving the words in the parentheses as they are, and adding "and except also," and then go on with the other sentence. That would make it apply simply to what you add and to that which is already in parentheses.

Mr. SIMMONS. That states it a little more clearly. The mutual workmen's compensation insurance companies thought they might be embraced in this provision unless they were expressly excepted from it; and, in response to their suggestion, we put in the exception.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The words just preceding the parenthesis are "or other branch of insurance"; so that, although the preceding language to that language expressed certain kinds of insurance, the broad language following it, "or other branch of insurance," would, if we did not put in the parentheses, have included every other form of insurance not at some other place in the bill expressly excluded. In that connection I want to say that the word "life" ought to be reinserted in the bill. I understand that was stricken out a moment ago.

Mr. STONE. We did not strike it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The object of this bill is to strike out from taxation all personal accident insurance, all health insurance, and all workmen's compensation insurance of a certain character.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What character?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is absolutely right about it. The word "life" was stricken out inadvertently. I did not at the minute when the Senator sug-

gested to me that it be stricken out advert to the three preceding words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary advises the Chair that the amendment striking out the word "life" has not been agreed to; it was merely a suggestion; the Senate has not acted upon it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it has not been agreed to, all that is necessary for the Senator from North Carolina to do is to withdraw the motion to strike out the word "life," or not make it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I withdraw it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Washington asked me what sort of workmen's compensation is included in this sentence. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina to read the language following the words "workmen's compensation insurance."

Mr. SIMMONS. The words are "workmen's compensation insurance carried on by members thereof solely for their own protection and not for profit." If the Senator will examine the language the Senator from Mississippi calls attention to, and which for the moment I did not advert to, he will see why this exception is put in just at that point. It is to meet the possible inference that might be drawn from the words "or other branch of insurance" and to make it clear that by the words "other branch of insurance" we do not intend to include life insurance, and so on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina now state the amendment as he would have it submitted to the Senate?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have already stated it, and I think the Secretary has it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I only desire to repeat, Mr. President, that while the Senator claims he is excepting these various kinds of insurance he is really including them by implication by force of the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is mistaken. We simply say in parentheses that we do not mean by the use of the words "other branch of insurance" to refer to the branches mentioned in the exception; that is all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is only one branch the Senator includes, and that is where the insurance is carried on for profit.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it means other branches of insurance of like kind, the kind of insurance enumerated above.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Where it is carried on by the members thereof for their own protection and not for profit. Unless it is qualified by that phrase, then it is not excepted. I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina why include any life insurance in this tax?

Mr. SIMMONS. None is included.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Or any class of insurance, such as fire insurance? Why do you include insurance at all as the subject of a special extraordinary tax?

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean fire insurance?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; fire insurance or accident insurance or marine insurance.

Mr. SIMMONS. Fire insurance is included. We put a tax upon policies of fire insurance and inland insurance, but we have not anywhere in the bill placed a tax on insurance on life. We are seeking to safeguard the possibility of any language employed in the bill being susceptible of a construction that it would include insurance on life or accident or health.

The Senator asked me, Why impose a tax on insurance policies, such as fire insurance? I do not think I need to say more about that than that I can see no reason why they should not pay a tax along with other things of like kind that are included in this bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Fire insurance is regarded generally as one of the necessary incidents of business and of the ownership of property.

Mr. SIMMONS. And so are deeds of conveyance, so are promissory notes, and so are a hundred—I will not say a hundred, but a score—of other things mentioned in this bill. I can think myself of no reason why policies of fire insurance should not be included. That part of the bill is an exact copy, I think, of the old law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It seems to me, Mr. President, that there must be some emergency in the mind of the chairman of the committee that the country does not know anything about that would justify levying a tax upon fire insurance or upon any insurance against loss of property.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that this provision is taken bodily from the act of 1898 and from the war-tax act of the Civil War.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator makes a comparison—

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not care to argue that question with the Senator; he can argue it if he desires so to do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not want the Senator to argue it with me; I was only asking him a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I merely expressed my opinion that it was a proper subject of taxation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not requesting the Senator to argue the matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator does not understand me as desiring to be at all curt about the matter. That was not my idea. I meant to say that I had stated all I cared to say about the matter, unless the Senator desires to ask me some other question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator made a statement comparing the conditions justifying the tax now proposed and the reason and necessity for it with the conditions that existed when the United States was involved in a flagrant war of unknown proportions. The country was threatened with a descent on the great, rich cities of the Atlantic coast by the Spanish war fleet. Nobody knew what they could do or what their power was; but from the past history of that country we supposed that they were able to do a great many things which events showed they were not able to do. It was, however, under that stress, in a state of actual war, that that tax was levied. Now the Senator says that, because we levied such a tax under those conditions, we are justified in doing so now in a period of profound peace.

Mr. SIMMONS. What the Senator is saying applies to the whole bill as much as it does to this particular section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington yields the floor. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington says that when the original act of 1898, from which most of this bill is copied, was passed by the Republican Party the country was "in a state of stress" and that now we are in "profound peace." That is literally true; but in spirit it is thoroughly inaccurate. The stress to which the country was subjected during the Spanish-American War was absolutely nothing compared to the stress to which the country is subjected right now. The effect of the continental war in Europe has been ten times as damaging to the United States as the Spanish-American War, in which they themselves were engaged. So that, if the stress and the emergency in 1898 justified the provisions of this law then, the greater stress and the greater Treasury emergency justifies a part of it now. The mere accident that we are not parties to the war—a big war—when we were at that time parties to what was, in comparison, a play war, or, at any rate, a little war, has nothing to do with the question. That is my answer to the Senator's remarks.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. WEEKS addressed the Chair.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, I am asking these questions in the utmost friendliness and not in any party spirit at all. I have a great deal of respect for the judgment and the accuracy of reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi; but I am greatly surprised that, with his candor of reasoning and sincerity of thought and expression, he can satisfy himself with the answer just made, that there is any such stress—or a much greater stress, as he has said—upon the United States to-day, justifying the levy of extraordinary and burdensome taxes upon the occupations and the business instruments of the people, as compared to what there was in 1898, when the honor and territorial integrity and, so far as we knew, the very existence of the Nation were at stake on account of the war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to remind the Senator from Washington that the emergency in 1898 was not enough to enlist at that time the sympathy and cooperation of the Senator from Mississippi in the passage of the bill that he cites as a precedent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why, Mr. President, everybody knows the wave of enthusiasm and deep, intense feeling that swept over this country in 1898 when war was declared, and young men throughout the country were crowding the recruiting offices in

order to offer their services and their lives in defense of the country; and the same feeling permeated the business world. Everyone was anxious to do his share to bear the burden of that war in taxes or in personal sacrifice. They do not feel that way now, however, because there is no such emergency existing.

If we levy a tax when we are at war, even though it be a little war, as the Senator characterizes that one, it will meet with the approval of the people and their willing acquiescence. They will be eager to support the finances of the Government when we are at war; but there is no sophistry of reasoning which will enable the Senator to come in here now, when there is no war, and justify a tax as a war tax.

The Senator can make a very plausible argument as to the stress under which the country is laboring now. We have different opinions upon what that stress is and the extent of it. I see a great many indications that this country, in a business and financial way, instead of being under a stress on account of this unfortunate and horrible European war, is going to profit very greatly by it, and is profiting by it, and will profit much more in the future by it. How the Senator can liken our present condition to a condition of war is not very clear to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have never said that "the honor of the country" was at stake now, as it was in 1898. I have said that the Treasury emergency and the general stress and strain of industry and finance now were greater than they were in 1898. The idea of "the existence of the Nation being at stake" when we went to war with Spain! There was no human being who ever dreamt that the existence of this Nation was at stake when we went to war with Spain. So much for that; but there was a question of honor.

What I say, however, is that the emergency now is five times as great; that the dislocation of industry is from three to five to ten times as great, and the same thing is true as to the dislocation of commerce and of exchange. As far as the effect of the Spanish-American War upon our Treasury was concerned, and the effect of this war upon our Treasury, the effect of this war upon our Treasury has been manyfold greater.

Why, the Spanish-American War did not interfere with our imports in the slightest degree; the Senator from Washington and I both know that; while we both know that this war has cut off our imports, which were revenue breeders, from Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, and France, to a large extent from Russia, and to some extent from Great Britain, and slightly further from all the world.

What is the emergency that justifies a new tax? It is an emergency in the Treasury—a threatened deficit. There was no emergency in the Treasury in 1898 except the emergency caused by the necessity of raising revenue to prepare an army for the field. That was upon the side of expenditures. The emergency now is upon the side of receipts. I say to the Senator in all due candor that the State of Mississippi alone, as far as industry, commerce, exchange, and fiscal arrangements are concerned, has already suffered more in these two months and a half of the European war than this entire country suffered in the whole course of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Mississippi that the country has suffered more from this war than it did from the war of 1898, but there is a great difference between the country suffering and the Government suffering. The purpose of this revenue bill is to raise income for the Government—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator confess that the Treasury has suffered, by the loss of import duties, more from this war than it did from the war of 1898?

Mr. LIPPITT. How much has the income of the Government suffered?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I read the figures here the other day; \$5,000,000 in eight days, I believe, in one place.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will read the Senator the figures.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wish the Senator would read them.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will read the Senator the falling off during the first 12 days.

Mr. LIPPITT. Of what?

Mr. SIMMONS. The falling off in imports.

Mr. LIPPITT. For the first 12 days of what?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of October.

Mr. LIPPITT. What was the falling off in revenue of the Government for the month of September? Has the Senator that?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not that at my fingers' ends right now.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then, if the Senator will excuse me, I will go on with what I was going to say.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the falling off in revenue during the first 12 days of October amounted to \$8,731,000. I think it was about \$9,000,000 in the month of September.

Mr. LIPPITT. The recollections of the Senator from North Carolina and myself agree. I have not here the exact figures for the month of September, but I will refer to them in a minute.

I started to say to the Senator from Mississippi when I rose, but was not allowed to finish the sentence, that the present revenue bill was a bill for the purpose of relieving the Treasury of the United States; that I agreed with the Senator from Mississippi that the people of the country had suffered more from this war than they had from the war of 1898, but that what the people suffered and what the Government suffered in its revenue were two entirely different matters.

As I understand the present situation, it is that in the month of September there was something like \$9,000,000 less revenue from customs than there was in the same month of the previous year; but Mr. UNDERWOOD, in his report upon this bill, admits that the falling off in revenue under the existing tariff law amounted to about \$4,000,000 per month; and therefore, for the month of September, the falling off in the revenues of the Government due to the war was about five and a half million dollars; or, in other words, at the rate of sixty-five to seventy million dollars a year. It is now proposed, on the basis of those figures, to assess—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield, and to whom?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the revenues derived under the Underwood-Simmons bill for the 10 months beginning with October, 1913, up to the 1st of August, 1914, before the war was declared, showed a deficiency of over \$30,000,000 as compared with what we had raised from customs the preceding year under the old tariff law, or an average loss of over \$3,000,000 per month during the 10 months preceding the war.

Mr. LIPPITT. I think the Senator is mistaken. I think they showed a loss of about \$4,000,000 a month. The Senator undoubtedly has on his desk the report of the chairman of the Finance Committee on this very subject.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LIPPITT. Just a minute. If the Senator from Minnesota will refer to page 7 of that report he will see that Mr. UNDERWOOD admits that the falling off in revenue averaged about \$4,000,000 a month, and that those figures have been reprinted and accepted by the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate. So I am going to use those figures, as having that very substantial authority, in the few remarks I am about to make.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island alluded to the loss of \$9,000,000 of revenue in the month of September. Is it not a fact that during the month of September, 1913, large quantities of merchandise were held in bond in anticipation of a reduction of duties following the passage of the then existing tariff bill?

Mr. LIPPITT. I think very likely that was the situation; but, for the purpose of completing what I thought were going to be a very few words that I was about to say, I am perfectly willing to base my remarks upon the figures for the month of September.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply wish to say to the Senator that the total falling off in customs revenues during the fiscal year 1914 amounted to about \$26,000,000, in round figures. For the months of July, August, September, and 13 days of October of this year, being 3 months and 13 days, there has been already a falling off of \$34,365,000, or about \$8,000,000 more for these three months and less than a half month than the total falling off during the fiscal year 1914.

Mr. LIPPITT. Do I understand the Senator from North Carolina to be making the argument that the sole reason for the enactment of this revenue bill is the decrease in the customs revenue resulting from the war?

Mr. SIMMONS. The reason for the enactment of this bill is the certainty, as we see it, of a loss of customs receipts, resulting from the curtailment of foreign importations, which will aggregate at least \$100,000,000. My own impression is that it will aggregate a great deal more than \$100,000,000, because instead of our imports increasing, I think they are going to continue to decrease until they are very much smaller than has been anticipated. As soon as Europe has sent us the accumulated stock of merchandise that she had on hand when the war began, I do not think there will be any sources from which she can draw for the purposes of foreign exportation to amount to anything.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator if this \$107,000,000 is to be raised for the sole purpose of meeting the deficiency caused by the war situation, when or in what form he proposes to bring in a bill to meet the deficiency in revenue that will be caused by the excessive expenditures for which this Congress has provided?

Mr. SIMMONS. There have been no excessive expenditures; but I do not desire to go into a discussion of that matter.

The situation is this, if the Senator will permit me: We were getting so much revenue from our customhouse. That revenue, under normal conditions, added to the revenue from internal-revenue taxes and income taxes, was amply sufficient to support the Government. Last year it not only supported it, but it left a surplus of \$34,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, yes; but last year you had a much less expensive Government.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, we are confronted with a falling off of imports, from which alone we can receive receipts through the customhouse, and that falling off, during the first 3 months and 13 days of this fiscal year, has been \$34,000,000, as against \$26,000,000 resulting from the decrease in tariff duties during the fiscal year of 1914. As we are facing a loss of \$100,000,000 in our customs receipts, this is simply to take the place of that loss, and to replenish the Treasury for the money that it will not get because the imports will not come in.

Mr. LIPPITT. Before the Senator takes his seat I hope he will answer the question which I asked him—how he expects to provide for the increased appropriations that have been made by this Congress over the estimated income of the Government?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the revenues that will be received, with the sum we are now proposing to raise to recoup the losses sustained from the falling off in imports, will be abundantly sufficient to pay all of the appropriations that this Congress has made; and if the war had not come on the ordinary receipts from the customhouse and the internal revenue would have been amply sufficient for that purpose.

When the Senator talks about the "great appropriations" we have made this year, I want to tell him that the appropriations we have made during this Congress for the next fiscal year exceed the appropriations that were made for the last fiscal year by only about \$9,000,000, as I now recall; and we paid the appropriations for the last fiscal year with the receipts raised by our system of taxation and had \$34,000,000 left.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does the Senator include the Panama expenditures in that statement?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the Panama expenditures are not included in that statement. The Panama expenditures are not a part of the ordinary appropriations. They have not been considered at any time a part of them. We provided for the issue of bonds out of which to pay them. After we had made the other appropriations, if we had a sufficient amount of money left in the Treasury to pay the expenses of constructing the Panama Canal in that year we took that money to pay those expenses, instead of issuing the bonds that a previous Congress had provided might be issued for the construction of the canal. Last year, fortunately, after we had paid all of the ordinary expenses of the Government and met every appropriation that Congress had made, we had enough left to pay all the expenses of constructing the Panama Canal; and we took the surplus and applied it to that purpose, instead of issuing those bonds.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has the floor.

Mr. LIPPITT. I want to ask the Senator from North Carolina, now that he has gone into this question, whether it is not a fact that the estimate of the Treasury Department of the

United States, which gives the figures which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House used in a very elaborate report which he made about two weeks ago upon the financial situation, did not show that the estimated revenues of the Government would be about \$50,000,000 short of the appropriations that had already been made?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not read that, and I do not know what it shows. I know, however, that the appropriations of the last fiscal year were \$1,098,000,000. I know that the appropriations up to the time we made that report this year were \$1,089,000,000. I know that the river and harbor bill has been passed since that time, which would run up the total to \$20,000,000 more, which would make a total of \$1,109,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The total appropriations up to date, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, are one billion one hundred and fifteen million six hundred and some odd thousand dollars.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know where the Senator from Utah gets his figures.

Mr. SMOOT. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is right back of the Senator. I will ask him if the figures I have given are not correct?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; the Senator from Virginia tells me that that is correct; so that it amounts to \$7,000,000 more than I had stated; but I was adding the \$20,000,000 for rivers and harbors to the \$1,089,000,000 referred to in Mr. FITZGERALD's statement.

I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] discussed all of these questions most elaborately here on yesterday, and if the Senator would stay in the Senate Chamber and hear these debates we would not have to go over the same ground every day.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have no doubt the Senator would much prefer not to have me go over it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, no; I do not care about the Senator's going over it, except in the interest of saving time.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator would go back and read what was said the other day, that would save time. Since he does not stay here to hear it, he might at least read it in the Record.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that I have read in the Record much of what has been said on this subject.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is now covering exactly the same ground again.

Mr. LIPPITT. I suppose I have a perfect right to do so—

Mr. STONE. Oh, the Senator has an absolute right to do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. Without having the Senator from Missouri undertake the task of telling me what I may or may not do in this body.

Mr. STONE. Oh, the Senator can say anything he pleases. I do not care.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now, that we have cleared up that situation, with the kind permission of the Senator I will go ahead and try to say the one or two sentences that I started to say when I first rose.

Mr. STONE. Well, go ahead, and for God's sake get through with it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Missouri will kindly stay and listen to me, I think he might learn something.

Mr. STONE. No; I can not learn anything from the Senator from Rhode Island, because I do not think he can convey any information to the Senate that it has not now; but he is a good waster of time.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from Missouri has great confidence in his supreme knowledge on various subjects, but I venture to say that possibly the Senator from Rhode Island may at some time convey some information to the Senate, and perhaps he has done so in the past. I certainly have listened a great deal to what the Senator from Missouri has had to say on various subjects, and I can not say that I remember any extraordinary amount of information that has come from that source. [Laughter.]

Mr. STONE. That may be true. I think the Senator from Rhode Island might convey information on some subjects.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am very glad the Senator admits that.

Mr. STONE. He might convey information on this subject if the whole thing had not been debated and debated here for days, until it was made threadbare, in the Senator's absence. Now, he comes here to waste hours again in beating over the same old straw. That is what I am objecting to.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not think I have talked as long as the Senator from Missouri has on this subject. I started to say one or two sentences, and the Senators on that side of the Chamber immediately wished to take my time, which I have been perfectly willing to have them do, and yielded willingly and kindly to them; but I think it is scarcely fair to come back and claim that I am using the time of the Senate, when perhaps, if there had been a careful record kept of the clock, it would have been found that somebody else had been using it.

All I started to say was this: The Senator from Mississippi was referring to the stress which was caused by the war in this country, and he was apparently justifying the tax which is now being levied by the fact that there was greater suffering and stress in this country, due to the situation the present war has caused, than that which resulted from the situation during the war of 1898.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A greater Treasury emergency.

Mr. LIPPITT. What I wished to say to him was that the emergency of the war of 1898 was entirely a Treasury emergency; that the tax which was levied at that time was for the sole purpose of reimbursing the Treasury; that there was a great strain upon the Treasury, because it was put to extraordinary expenses on account of the war; and that it seemed to me like a very curious argument to advance that because the people of this country were suffering in an extraordinary manner from the disasters that have been caused by this war, the Democratic Party should also want to add to that suffering a tax of \$107,000,000. It seemed to me that the suffering they were undergoing was quite great enough, without adding to it the additional and onerous burden of a tax about one-half of which, I think, from the figures I have seen, is not due at all to the war, but is due to the extravagant and unparalleled expenditures which the Democratic Congress has made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what I said was that this bill was as much justified by the fiscal and Treasury exigencies as the bill of 1898, in which was contained the language criticized by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

Now, let me see. This bill proposes to raise \$100,000,000 of extra revenue. The falling off of customs receipts in the first month of this war—the month of August—was \$11,000,000. The falling off in September, the second month of this war—I am giving round figures—was \$9,000,000. The two added together make \$20,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I be allowed to interrupt the Senator at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me get through with the sum in arithmetic; I have not finished the sentence. To go back and repeat, then, so that the Senator may catch it: In August, the first month of this war, the falling off was \$11,000,000; in September, the second month of the war, it was \$9,000,000, or a total of \$20,000,000. In the half month, or nearly half month—it is not quite a half month—of October which is past, it was \$8,750,000. Now, there is a total of twenty-eight and three-quarter million dollars of loss of revenue at the customhouses in two months and a half.

The Democratic Party therefore concluded that if there would be a corresponding fall in the revenue for the balance of the year, at least \$100,000,000 would be needed to cover the threatened deficit. These are all comparisons between the revenue of the two and a half months in this year and of the last year. Now, if the country suffered a loss of customs receipts because of the falling off of importations in two months and a half of the war of twenty-eight and three-quarter million dollars, it would suffer five times that much in a year.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will not the Senator deduct something from that falling off owing to the fact that the tariff law his party has passed also very largely reduced the revenue for each of the preceding months that it has been in existence. The Senator does not propose to assume that the entire falling off in revenues is due to the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not assuming it.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute. There would be a total falling off of \$114,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now, Mr. President, if—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute—

Mr. LIPPITT. The report of Mr. UNDERWOOD claims that at least an average of \$4,000,000 a month was due to the tariff law. That is at the rate, if we are going to use the Senator's figures, of \$48,000,000 a year. The Senator says that the war cost to the Government so far has been \$114,000,000, and the total revenue fall is at the rate of \$114,000,000 a year. If we deduct \$48,000,000 from \$114,000,000, it leaves somewhere in the

neighborhood of \$70,000,000, and if the lack of revenue by reason of the war is \$70,000,000, which is the outside that these figures show, why should we raise a tax of \$110,000,000 except for the fact that the report of the Treasury shows that that was the deficit?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, I hope I will have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island. Twenty-eight million dollars in two and a half months is about \$140,000,000 a year. I said a moment ago \$114,000,000. It is \$140,000,000. That is the falling off. Now, the \$4,000,000 a month, assuming that figure to be correct for argument's sake, or \$48,000,000 was from the fact that we reduced taxes upon the people by putting various things upon the free list—

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator does not mean to say that we reduced the taxes upon the people. What he means to say is that we changed the form of taxes on the people and reduced the revenue from that source.

Mr. WILLIAMS. However fine a user of English the Senator from Rhode Island may be, I prefer to select my own phraseology. Now, suppose \$48,000,000 of that amount resulted from our removing tariff taxes from the backs and bellies of the people by putting various things upon the free list and by reducing tariff taxes upon other things; deducting that left \$92,000,000, and this bill, calculated to raise \$100,000,000, will leave us a margin-only of \$8,000,000. I say we have not raised revenue too much; that, if anything, we have raised it too little in this bill. Why? Because in my opinion the importations are going to continue to grow less rather than greater, and the customs receipts are therefore going to continue to grow less rather than greater, and the total revenues therefore to diminish, unless made up by an increase from other sources. The only excuse for not providing more revenue in this bill is that we are going to meet again in December, and if we find that our present diagnosis of the case is not correct, then we can bring in another bill to meet the increased deficit.

In all this I have admitted for the sake of argument the Senator's contention of a falling off in customs revenues from those which would have been collected under the Dingley bill of \$48,000,000 per annum. When we framed the Underwood-Simmons bill we calculated upon and provided for a decrease of \$50,000,000 in customs receipts. This decrease was a decrease of the burden of taxation, which otherwise would have rested on all the people, and principally upon the poor, least able to stand it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi is very frank in his statement as to the loss of revenue from customs. Would he not be equally frank and admit that your calculation with reference to the amount you expected to derive from the income and corporation tax was very disappointing also?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will pardon me just one sentence more, I think it was stated here that you expected to raise \$122,000,000 from the corporation and income tax. It has turned out that you have raised \$71,000,000. That is not chargeable to any war in Europe, but it is chargeable to miscalculation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not a muzzie-loading shotgun which scatters at the breach. When I get up to talk about one question I do not undertake at the same time to talk about every other question in the world. I have denied the statement of the Senator, but do not care to argue it. I wish to stick to my text. I am talking now about the falling off in receipts from customs duties and the necessity of supplying that deficit. Whether we made a miscalculation with regard to the income and corporation tax or not has nothing to do with the case, any more than "the flowers that bloom in the spring," because of the very simple fact that our income tax, plus internal revenue, plus customs, plus other and miscellaneous sources of revenue, were bringing in enough to pay the expenses of the Government, and more than enough, even with somewhat extravagant appropriations. Now, if we made a mistake, it was a very lucky thing that we made it; otherwise we would have piled up more money in the Treasury than ought to have been piled up. But that has nothing to do with this question. I want to drive this question right down to its point, and that is whether there exists no Treasury exigency, actual or threatened, to justify this tax.

If the Senator from Michigan be right, there exists a greater emergency than I thought. It does not make a bit of difference why the emergency, why the deficit exists; there is that

much money needed to be raised by taxation, and the Democratic Party can not justify itself before the country unless it can show that that much more money is needed. I say, and the facts prove, that the falling off of revenue receipts to the extent of \$100,000,000 per year is the cause of the threatened deficit, and that the war is the cause of that falling off.

I say that the cause of its being needed was the falling off in imports. The Senator from Michigan may say that it was for any other reason he pleases, but I say it is from the falling off of imports, and this falling off of imports for the entire year, if calculated at the rate of two and a half times \$28,000,000, will be \$140,000,000 for a year.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. So we justify the raising of \$100,000,000 by special taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to just what happened in August as the result of the falling off in imports. The Senator will agree with me that there was a falling off of \$8,000,000 in August.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In August?

Mr. WEEKS. In August.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was a falling off of \$11,000,000.

Mr. WEEKS. Eight million dollars in imports and \$11,400,000 in revenue. Those are the correct figures, taken from the Treasury statement. Now, of that \$11,400,000 revenue loss due to importations—I have the exact figures here—\$9,727,000 was due to the reduction in duties and only \$1,776,000 could be charged to the reduction in the importations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator can not make that.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator can convince himself that any of those figures are not correct, I would be glad to have him do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is very easy to take a thing formerly on the dutiable list and figure out a certain rate, and calculate the rate it would have been, but that is wrapping things in a mere cloud of obscurity and has nothing to do with this case. The sole thing here, the point to which I want to pin the matter down, is that we provided a revenue for this country from several sources, and in one particular regard, to wit, the customs part of that revenue, there will be a failure of \$140,000,000 during this year below our former year's receipts and nearly, if not quite, \$100,000,000 below our correct calculation, based on peace conditions, and our therefore first expectation. That is all.

Every other argument concerning it all is aliunde, irrelevant, or obtuse.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, it is very refreshing to me, and I presume it will be to the taxpayers of this country to have the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate, inform us that this bill is only a starter and that when Congress meets in December we may look for still another addition to the burdens of the taxpayers of the country.

I do not think it is exactly fair, Mr. President, for the chairman of the Finance Committee and the Senator from Mississippi to hold up the first 12 days of this month for a comparison, comparing the revenues for the first half of this month with the same period last year, because they well know that immediately following the enactment of the present tariff bill on the 3d of October last year there was entered at the customhouses an enormous quantity of goods which had been held in bond, and that the revenues for the early part of October last year were largely in excess of normal revenues for that period. I have not the figures at hand to show exactly what they were, but the revenues for October, 1913, were largely in excess of the ordinary revenues for October, and the customs revenues for the first 12 days of this month do not by any means fall to the extent of \$12,000,000 below ordinary and normal revenues for the same period in any ordinary year.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think that the Senate ought to take any Senator's opinion when we have the daily statement of the United States Treasury before us showing the exact conditions of Government receipts.

I simply want to call attention to this fact, and it is a fact, that on October 12, 1914, the receipts of the Government as compared with the receipts of the Government a year ago upon the same date show a loss of only \$14,497,916.67, or, in other words, that the Government of the United States received from all sources during this fiscal year, from June 30 until October

12, as much money as they did the last fiscal year, with the exception of \$14,497,916.67. Mr. President, that includes the shortage of customs revenues from October 1 to October 12 of \$8,731,000.23. So all that the Government starts out with on the 12th day of October by way of shortage of receipts from a year ago amount, as I stated, to \$14,497,916.67.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. May I ask the Senator from Utah what would have been the amount of revenue paid into the Treasury on the identical importations at the rate in force under the Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator means for the full year?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; for the period the Senator is now criticizing during which the Underwood law was in operation. What would have been the difference? Why does the Senator attribute it to the low rate fixed in the Democratic tariff law without comparing it with the revenue that would have been derived had the importations taken place under the Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I can give the Senator the figures he wants.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It is immaterial from what source I get them, so that they are reliable.

Mr. NELSON. From the 1st of October, 1913, three days before the tariff bill was passed, up to the 1st of August this year the total revenue amounted to \$229,461,767, and for the same months of the preceding year under the former tariff law the total revenue was \$260,122,137. It is the difference between \$229,000,000 and \$260,000,000.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. But that does not answer the question that I intended to ask. Assuming that the same identical articles were imported under the Payne-Aldrich law that were imported under the present tariff law, what would have been the revenue paid into the United States Treasury? We must know that, it seems to me, before we can say that the reduced rates in the present tariff law are responsible for the smaller amount of revenue received.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I do not want to make a statement that I can not prove by the Treasury Department, as the Senator knows, but I can make an estimate of the amount, and that is all that anyone can do unless he took the items imported and compared them under the two laws. I will say to the Senator that the amount of goods imported under the Payne-Aldrich law for the first 11 months—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. They may have been entirely different goods.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I stated to the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Different articles bear different rates, and if you want to institute a comparison it ought to be on the same units.

Mr. SMOOT. I just stated that that is true, but I want to say to the Senator the average rate under the Payne-Aldrich Act was about 44 per cent and the average rate under the Underwood Act is about 26 per cent. So the only way by which we could come to any reasonable conclusion as to the amount would be by using the two averages. But I will say to the Senator, as I stated before, I could not give the exact figures until I saw just the items that were imported, the quantities imported, and the rates that they carried under one law and the other.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does not the Senator think it will be necessary to have that information before we can intelligently and justly criticize the present law with having resulted in a reduced collection of revenue?

Mr. SMOOT. No; because of the fact we all know what the reduced revenue is. There is not any question about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has made some quotations from the Treasury statement of receipts and disbursements during this fiscal year as compared with the last fiscal year. The Senator will discover that the customs receipts submitted by the Treasury Department for the past fiscal year were \$99,725,000 in round figures. The customs receipts as given by the department this year were \$65,333,000, making a difference in the customs receipts for this period as compared with those of last year of \$34,000,000. Now, the Senator in order to reach the results he just now gave confused in his computation the miscellaneous items. The miscellaneous items for the last fiscal year were \$13,856,000 in round numbers. This year the amount was \$26,191,000, being considerably more,

but the difference was owing to the price we received from the two ships that we sold.

Mr. SMOOT. That is absolutely true, Mr. President, and that does not dispute anything I stated.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am simply making the statement to show exactly what were the receipts this year as compared with those of last year.

In the last two months we have received quite a considerable increase from internal revenue. That resulted, as everybody knows, from the large sales of whisky during those months, arising from the apprehension of the holders that a tax would be imposed upon whisky. Therefore they have drawn it rapidly out of the warehouses, and the receipts from that source have increased. But when you come to customhouse receipts there can be no question that the customhouse receipts last year for the three months of July, August, and September, and for the first 12 days of October, amounted, as I said, to \$99,000,000, lacking only \$25,000 of a hundred million dollars; but this year they have amounted during the same period to only \$65,303,000. I did not desire to make any argument, but merely to make that statement.

Now, if the Senator from Utah will pardon me, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island—

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator leaves that point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator had yielded.

Mr. SMOOT. I did yield the floor to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Utah had yielded before the Senator from North Carolina began.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in this connection I merely want to make one further observation, and that is, that every argument that has been made upon the other side as to the reduction of tariff duties is based upon the receipts from the Payne-Aldrich Act. When the new law was passed it was passed with the understanding that the receipts would be less under the Democratic law. Everybody admitted it. There was an income tax imposed to make up that deficiency. So the comparison is not fair. The only just comparison is to take the revenues of the Government as expected from the Underwood Act, including the revenues from the income tax and from every other source.

The Senator from North Carolina was perfectly right in what he said in relation to the falling off of the customs duties by some \$34,000,000 so far in this fiscal year; but the receipts from all sources up to the 12th day of this month, as compared with those of a year ago, with all that was collected under the Payne-Aldrich rates, amounted, as I said before, to only \$14,497,916.67. On the 12th day of October this Government started out with that difference in its receipts from what they were a year ago, and no less. That is what we ought to figure upon, and that is all we ought to take into consideration up to that day in passing the revenue bill. I do not believe anybody will attempt to dispute that fact, and I know it can not be successfully disputed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply wish to add to what I have already said a brief statement. We did, as the Senator from Utah observes, calculate that there would be a falling off in revenue as the result of the reduction in tariff duties. There was a falling off, as a matter of fact, in the last fiscal year of \$23,000,000. That was less than we expected; we expected it would be more than that; but with that falling off during the last fiscal year the receipts from customs, supplemented by the receipts from the income tax and the internal revenue, were sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government. Now, already, in a little over three months, there has been a falling off of customs duties during this fiscal year of about \$8,000,000 more than we lost during the whole of the fiscal year 1914. If that proportion of falling off in the customs revenues shall continue this year, it is perfectly apparent that there will be, instead of a loss of \$23,000,000, a loss of \$150,000,000 in our customs revenues.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from North Carolina will not make that statement after consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. That statement is incorrect?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that statement is incorrect.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that falling off should continue, it would be a little less than four times \$34,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be a little more than four times \$8,000,000. The whole loss of last year was \$26,000,000, while the loss up to the present time is \$34,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. The estimates that I made had reference to the falling off during the months since the European war. If the falling off during the months since the war—that is, during the months of August, September, and October—shall continue, then there will be a loss of \$150,000,000 in customs revenue.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina, and also to the Senate and to the country, that there will not be a loss in customs revenue of \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am stating this upon the calculations of the Actuary of the Treasury. I have not myself calculated it.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to a statement which he made through inadvertence. In his statement the Senator from Rhode Island said that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House had estimated that during the last fiscal year there was a falling off in revenue to the amount of \$4,000,000. If the Senator from Rhode Island will read the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the other House, he will see that he has made a mistake. He has confused the average monthly additional receipts from the income and from the corporation taxes with the falling off in the customs revenues. The falling off in the customs revenues, as given by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, was \$26,000,000 for the fiscal year 1914. That was a little over \$2,000,000 a month; but he does not in his calculation—and I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island got that calculation—estimate for the next year our receipts from the income tax and from the corporation tax. I believe he reached the conclusion that the increase amounted, as resulting from the income tax and the change in the corporation tax, to a little over \$4,000,000. I refer to the figures the Senator gave a little while ago. The actual falling off in the revenues last year as he gives it was only a little over \$2,000,000 a month. Up to this time the actual falling off has been more than \$10,000,000 a month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I thought the Senator from North Carolina was through.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was proposing to proceed with the amendments.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I will only take one single moment, if the Senator will allow me. In the course of my remarks a short time ago I made the statement that the estimated expenditures and the estimated income of the Government differed somewhere in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000. I now have before me—which I did not at that moment have—the report which was submitted to the other House by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which is published on page 16423 of the Record, and which I should like to have included as a part of my remarks on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, permission to do so will be granted.

(The table referred to is printed on following page.)

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, it will be seen that that table shows that the estimated appropriations of the Government were \$1,089,408,777.26, and that the total estimated revenue was \$1,038,000,000, showing a difference of about \$50,000,000, as I have stated.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to put in the Record, once for all, these facts: The total appropriations for the support of the Government made for the fiscal year 1913 were \$1,019,412,710.91. For the fiscal year 1914 the total appropriations were \$1,095,678,788.40, an increase for the fiscal year 1914 over the fiscal year 1913 of something over \$79,000,000.

The appropriations for the fiscal year 1915, including the \$20,000,000 for the river and harbor bill, were \$1,109,403,777.26, showing that for the two fiscal years ending 1914 and 1915, respectively, there have been appropriated a total in excess of former years of about \$170,000,000.

Chronological history of appropriation bills, second session of the Sixty-third Congress, estimates and appropriations for the fiscal year 1914-15, and appropriations for the fiscal year 1913-14.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House.]

Title.	Estimates, 1915.	Reported to the House.		Passed the House.		Reported to the Senate.		Passed the Senate.		Law, 1914-15.		Law, 1913-14.
		Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Amount.
Agriculture...	\$19,061,332.00	1914. Feb. 20	\$18,947,232.00	1914. Mar. 14	\$18,988,232.00	1914. Apr. 16	\$19,511,302.00	1914. May 23	\$20,089,012.00	1914. June 30	\$19,865,832.00	\$17,086,045.00
Army.....	104,947,758.65	Feb. 16	94,194,277.16	Feb. 28	94,190,577.16	Mar. 21	101,815,583.35	Mar. 28	101,730,118.50	Apr. 27	101,019,212.50	94,286,146.81
Diplomatic and Consular.....	4,447,042.66	Apr. 17	4,483,702.66	May 16	4,455,852.66	June 12	4,359,986.66	June 16	4,366,086.66	June 30	4,309,856.66	3,730,642.66
District of Columbia.....	14,491,614.49	1913. Dec. 15	11,465,480.49	Jan. 12	11,436,150.49	Mar. 6	13,137,256.49	Mar. 13	13,137,456.49	July 21	12,172,539.49	11,383,739.00
Fortification.....	9,124,399.49	1914. Jan. 23	5,175,200.00	Jan. 29	5,175,200.00	Feb. 6	6,895,200.00	Feb. 9	6,895,200.00	June 27	5,627,700.00	5,218,259.00
Indian.....	10,208,865.06	Jan. 28	8,661,737.82	Feb. 20	8,661,737.82	May 15	10,787,577.76	June 24	10,800,763.76	Aug. 1	9,771,902.76	9,483,819.67
Legislative, etc.....	39,584,709.70	Apr. 1	36,449,169.70	Apr. 17	36,532,109.70	May 25	37,238,278.70	June 15	37,841,158.70	July 16	37,630,229.70	35,172,434.50
Military Academy.....	1,052,875.61	Feb. 23	988,289.75	Feb. 28	988,289.75	Mar. 21	1,009,199.54	Mar. 28	1,009,099.54	Apr. 15	997,899.54	1,099,302.87
Navy.....	144,417,453.53	Feb. 28	139,904,333.61	May 7	139,808,333.61	May 14	140,990,833.61	June 2	141,164,433.61	June 30	* 144,868,716.61	140,800,643.53
Pension.....	169,150,000.00	Apr. 1	169,150,000.00	May 9	169,150,000.00	June 8	169,150,000.00	June 16	169,150,000.00	June 20	169,150,000.00	180,300,000.00
Post Office.....	306,963,117.00	Jan. 12	306,952,867.00	Jan. 24	307,013,867.00	Feb. 18	310,652,267.00	Feb. 28	311,772,067.00	Mar. 9	313,364,067.00	285,376,271.00
River and harbor.....	* (34,296,395.00)	Feb. 24	(39,221,504.00)	Mar. 26	(39,408,004.00)	June 18	(43,330,404.00)	(5)	* (41,073,094.00)
Sundry civil.....	* 119,779,806.83	June 4	107,694,609.28	June 25	107,944,209.28	July 6	111,411,159.06	July 8	112,269,138.56	Aug. 1	* 110,070,227.39	* 116,795,327.01
Total.....	943,218,975.02	904,125,899.47	904,344,569.47	923,958,644.17	930,224,534.82	928,848,783.65	901,616,520.75
Urgent deficiency.....	10 25,000,000.00	Feb. 19	9,639,397.79	Feb. 26	9,754,068.59	Mar. 17	10,843,321.98	Mar. 18	10,850,821.98	Apr. 6	10,629,825.54
Deficiency, 1914, and prior years.....	May 13	6,770,632.24	May 21	6,835,632.24	May 22	6,835,632.24	May 22	6,835,632.24	May 25	6,835,632.24	28,074,912.31
Total.....	968,218,975.02	925,126,513.58	925,528,745.38	950,717,498.39	954,229,173.99	952,212,370.26	929,691,433.06
Miscellaneous.....	10 13,030,000.00	6,000,000.00	388,597.22
Total, regular annual appropriations.....	981,218,975.02	958,212,370.26	930,080,030.28
Permanent annual appropriations.....	11 131,196,407.00	11 131,196,407.00	127,525,664.12
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations.....	1,112,415,382.02	12 1,089,408,777.26	1,057,605,694.40

Amount of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1915..... \$728,000,000
 Amount of estimated postal revenues for fiscal year 1915..... 308,000,000

Total of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1915..... 1,036,000,000

* One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department (estimated for 1915 at \$136,860), which are payable from the revenues of the water department.

† Includes \$4,635,000 out of proceeds of sale of battleship; Idaho and Mississippi.

‡ Includes all expenses of the Postal Service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury.

§ No river and harbor act having become a law, the amount of the estimates, the dates and amounts of the bill in its several stages of consideration up to this time, and the amount of the last law are shown (in parentheses) in order to preserve their history, but none of the amounts are included in the totals stated herein.

|| No river and harbor act has become a law at this session, but the sum of \$6,988,500 is appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts heretofore authorized for river and harbor improvements.

¶ The sum of \$10,045,795 was appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1914.

‡ This amount includes \$7,217,500 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$26,326,985 for construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1915, and is exclusive of \$5,593,221 carried under "Miscellaneous."

§ This amount includes \$6,988,500 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$21,842,475 for construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1915.

¶ This amount includes \$10,045,795 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$21,135,393 for construction and fortification of the Panama Canal for 1914.

|| This amount is approximated.

‡ This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1915, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until two years after the close of the fiscal year. This amount includes estimated amount of \$60,717,000 to meet sinking-fund obligations for 1915.

§ In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the fortification act, \$800,000; by the naval act, \$26,650,000; by the sundry civil act, \$810,000; in all, \$28,060,000.

|| In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the Army act, \$150,000; by the District of Columbia act, \$1,615,000; by the fortification act, \$300,000; by the naval act, \$21,296,524; by the river and harbor act, \$6,795,800; by the public buildings act, \$38,347,850 (exclusive of \$8,161,000 for authorizations without contracts, etc.); in all, \$68,505,174.

Coming to the matter of income collected from the tariff duties for the 10 months counting from the 1st of October, 1913, which was three days prior to the passage of the Underwood tariff law, up to the end of July, 1914, the total income from the tariff was \$229,461,967. For the same 10 months in the preceding year the total income was \$260,122,037, showing that during 10 months under the Underwood-Simmons law from the time of its passage up to the 1st of August last, before the outbreak of the war in Europe, the loss in revenue was \$30,660,070, or an average of over \$3,000,000 a month as compared with the income from the tariff during the same months under the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was unable to hear the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, as Senators were talking to me; but I understood that he was comparing the customs receipts of the last year with those of the previous year, and that he also made a comparison of appropriations. I do not know

what result he reached; but I want to suggest to the Senator that if he will investigate the tables a little further he will find that from 1906 to 1910, during which period his party was in power, the increase in the appropriations amounted in those four years to \$268,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Democratic Party went before the country and bitterly criticized the Republicans for the natural increases, and called it "a profligate waste."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to state that I think one important fact was omitted by the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and I think the same fact has been omitted by a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle.

It is true that the appropriations for the current expenses of the Government for the fiscal year closing June 30, 1914, were \$1,098,000,000; it is also true that the appropriations for the current expenses of the Government for the fiscal year closing June 30, 1915, were \$1,115,000,000, an apparent increase of \$17,000,000, or less than the ordinary average increase; but I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, and I call the attention of other Senators to the fact that that apparent increase is due to and is explained by an increase of \$27,000,000 in the appropriations for the Postal Service.

The Senator knows that the Postal Service pays its own way; it is no charge on the Treasury of the United States; it is no charge on the revenues arising either from customs duties or from internal revenue. Deducting that item, the appropriations for the year 1915 are less by \$10,000,000, at least, than the appropriations for 1914, not to speak of the additional extraordinary expense arising out of the Mexican situation. I think that ought to be stated in order to complete the record.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I have never made any comparisons between appropriations for the year 1914 and those for the year 1915. They were all passed by a Democratic Congress. My comparisons were between the last appropriation bills for which the Republican Party was responsible and the appropriation bills enacted during the present session.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, just which appropriation bills does the Senator now claim credit for on behalf of the Republican Party?

Mr. SMOOT. The last ones when the party was in power—1913.

Mr. GORE. I will suggest, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives, under the Constitution of the United States, is charged with the origination of revenue measures and charged with the origination of appropriation bills, and those measures, the economy of which has been so loudly exploited by Senators on the other side, originated in a Democratic House, and their economy is due to the insistence of the Democratic House.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that the Senate was Republican and had the last say so on the appropriation bills.

Mr. GORE. I will suggest that the appropriation bills in the Sixty-second Congress were higher when they passed the Senate than they were when they came to the Senate from the Democratic House.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; it was known from one end of this country to the other that items were left out of the appropriation bills by the House with the avowed purpose of showing how extravagant was the Republican Senate and to be used for political purposes. Items amounting to millions of dollars were left out by the House knowing they would have to be added in the Senate.

I want to say to the Senator also that ever since the Government began appropriation bills as sent to the Senate from the House are less than the appropriation bills after they have passed the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Of course that is true, but I was simply observing that the measures to which the Senator has referred originated in a Democratic House, and the first effort I have heard to exploit those measures for partisan purposes has been by the Senators on the other side appropriating exclusive credit to a Republican Senate, when the credit, at least, must be shared by the Democratic House.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to be perfectly fair in my statement. I could have gone back a year further, when the House was Republican and the Senate was also Republican, and could have shown that the appropriations were still less, but I did not want it to be said by the Senator from Oklahoma, or by any other Senator, that I was going back four years and not taking into consideration the natural increase that comes to appropriation bills because of the growth of the country. So I simply went back two years, when the Senate was Republican and was responsible for the totals carried by the appropriation bills.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if it is not a fact that, notwithstanding the Democratic denunciation of Republican extravagance, the last appropriation bills passed when the House and the Senate were both Republican carried less than any bill that has been passed since that time, even when the appropriation bills have originated in a Democratic House?

Mr. SMOOT. No doubt that is true.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Washington tell the amount carried by the deficiency bills at the following session? That would be essential to a completion of that argument.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I will say, in response to the observation made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], that the deficiency bills never have been so high as they were in the Congress preceding the present one, when there was a Democratic House and a Republican Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the word "accident" and the comma after it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On the same page, line 16, after the word "any," I move to insert the word "liability" and a comma.

The SECRETARY. After the word "any," in line 16, page 40, and before the word "fidelity," it is proposed to insert the word "liability" and a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On the same page, at the end of line 19, I move to insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 19, after the word "thereof," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following words:

Provided, That whenever a policy is canceled or returned or a premium is returned or refunded, in whole or in part, the tax upon such unearned, returned, or refunded premium, or part thereof, shall be repaid pro rata to the person, association, or corporation paying the same. Statements verified by some officer of the company or companies availing themselves of this provision shall be made and filed with the collector of the proper district every 30 days, setting forth the items upon which such refund is to be made: *Provided further*, That policies of reinsurance shall be exempt from the tax herein imposed by this paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 41, line 11, after the word "ticket," I move to insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. After the word "passenger," in line 11, I move to insert "sold in the United States for passage."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary informs the Chair that the words "for each passenger" have not been agreed to, and the Chair will put the question on that amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the word "ticket" and the comma, just agreed to, it is proposed to insert the words "for each passenger."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understand those words have been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; they have been agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Secretary to state the last amendment? I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the word "passenger," it is proposed to insert the words "sold in the United States for passage."

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator having the bill in charge to read the paragraph as he intends to have it finally amended? Then I can follow it and see what changes are made.

Mr. SIMMONS. It would then read:

Passage ticket, sold in the United States for passage by any vessel from a port in the United States to a foreign port—

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator proposes to strike that out?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I want to strike out "from a port in the United States." That is the next amendment. After the word "vessel," in line 11, I move to strike out down to and including the word "States"; that is, strike out "from a port in the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Secretary state the last amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "from a port in the United States," so that, if amended, the paragraph will read:

Passage ticket, sold in the United States for passage by any vessel to a foreign port.

Mr. WILLIAMS. "For each passenger."

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me it ought to be "to a foreign port or place." They may land somewhere where there is not a port, and to cover the whole thing it ought to read "or place."

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, that amendment will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am not certain that I understood the Secretary. Was the language "for each passenger," in line 11, adopted?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to inquire if the Secretary has left out the words "for each passenger"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been inserted, so the Secretary advises the Chair.

Mr. SIMMONS. All right.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I move to strike out what is printed as section 3 of the bill, beginning on page 4, and to substitute the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of section 3, as proposed by the committee and printed in the bill on pages 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. That upon all still wines, domestic and imported, when sold or offered for sale or consumption, there shall be levied and collected taxes as follows: On each bottle containing one-fourth pint or less, one-fourth cent; on each bottle containing more than one-fourth pint and not more than one-half pint, one-half cent; on each bottle containing more than one-half pint and not more than 1 pint, 1 cent; and on each bottle containing more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart, 2 cents; and on still wines in all other containers, not herein specially provided for, the tax shall be at the rate of 8 cents per gallon.

That upon all domestic and imported champagne wines, when sold or offered for sale or consumption, there shall be levied and collected taxes as follows: Upon each bottle containing one-half pint or less, 7 cents; on each bottle containing more than one-half pint and not more than 1 pint, 13 cents; on each bottle containing more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart, 25 cents; and on all other containers at the rate of 25 cents per quart; and on all artificially carbonated wines there shall be levied and collected taxes as follows: On each bottle containing not more than one-half pint, 2½ cents; more than one-half pint and not more than 1 pint, 5 cents; more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart, 10 cents; and on all other containers at the rate of 10 cents per quart; and on all liqueurs, cordials, or similar compounds, domestic and imported, by whatever name sold or offered for sale, there shall be levied and collected a tax on each bottle containing not more than one-half pint, 1½ cents; more than one-half pint and not more than 1 pint, 3 cents; more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart, 6 cents; and on larger containers a tax at the rate of 24 cents per gallon.

All of the taxes imposed in the preceding paragraphs of this section shall be paid by stamps to be affixed to each bottle or container in which such still wines, champagne wines, carbonated wines, liqueurs, or cordials, or similar compounds are sold or offered for sale: *Provided*, That when such still wines, champagne wines, carbonated wines, liqueurs, cordials, or similar compounds, taxable under the provisions of this section, are sold or delivered by the producer, importer, or dealer in wholesale quantities to other dealers, including rectifiers, manufacturing chemists, and druggists, the dealer receiving and selling, or offering the same for sale or consumption to any person other than a dealer, shall affix thereto the stamps hereinbefore prescribed: *And provided further*, That the stamp tax herein imposed shall not be collected on any still wine used by any rectifier, manufacturing chemist, or druggist in the manufacture of any medicinal preparation, proprietary articles, liqueur, cordial, or compound subject to any internal-revenue tax imposed by this act.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall cause to be prepared suitable and special stamps denoting the tax herein imposed, to be affixed and canceled in such manner as he, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe; and in the absence of such stamps from any bottle or container containing wine, liqueur, cordial, or compound taxable under the provisions of this section, sold or offered for sale or consumption, shall be prima facie evidence that the tax thereon has not been paid, and all such wines, liqueurs, cordials, or compounds shall be forfeited to the United States.

There shall be levied and assessed against the maker or producer of all wines fortified under the provisions and conforming to the requirements of the sections of the tariff act of October 1, 1890, relating to the fortification of pure sweet wines, as amended, and as further amended by this act, a tax of 55 cents on each taxable gallon of grape brandy or wine spirits used by him in the fortification of such wines: *Provided, however*, That the maker or producer of such fortified wines shall, under regulations and suitable bonds, to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, have assessed against him monthly the said tax of 55 cents on each taxable gallon of grape brandy or wine spirits used by him during the preceding month, which assessment shall be paid within 90 days from the date of notice thereof: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as exempting any still wines, cordials, liqueurs, or similar compounds from the payment of any stamp tax provided for in this section.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized to make all necessary regulations to make effective the provisions of this section.

That sections 42, 43, 45, 46, and 49 of the act of October 1, 1890, as amended by section 68 of an act approved August 28, 1894, and by an act approved June 7, 1906, are further amended to read as follows:

SEC. 42. That any producer of pure sweet wines may use in the preparation of such sweet wines, under such regulations, and after the filings of such notices and bonds, together with the keeping of such records and the rendition of such reports as to materials and products as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe, wine spirits produced by any duly authorized distiller, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in determining the liability of any distiller of wine spirits to assessment under section 3309 of the Revised Statutes, is authorized to allow such

distiller credit in his computations for the wine spirits withdrawn to be used in fortifying sweet wines under this act: *Provided*, That such wine containing after fortification more than 24 per cent of alcohol, as defined by section 3249 of the Revised Statutes, shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 43. That the wine spirits mentioned in section 42 of this act is the product resulting from the distillation of fermented grape juice, or residues of grapes to which water may have been added prior to, during, or after fermentation for the sole purpose of facilitating the fermentation and economical distillation thereof, and shall be held to include the product from grapes commonly known as grape brandy, and shall include commercial grape brandy which may have been colored with burnt sugar or caramel; and the pure sweet wine which may be fortified with wine spirits under the provisions of this act is fermented with partially fermented grape juice only, with the usual cellar treatment, and shall contain no other substance whatever introduced before, at the time of, or after fermentation, except as herein expressly provided: *Provided*, That the addition of pure boiled or condensed grape must or pure crystallized cane or beet sugar, or pure dextrose sugar, or water, or any or all of them, to the pure grape juice before fermentation, or in the fermented product of such grape juice, or to both, prior to the fortification provided in this act, either for the purpose of perfecting sweet wines according to commercial standards or for mechanical purposes, shall not be excluded by the definition of pure sweet wine aforesaid: *Provided, however*, That the cane or beet sugar or pure dextrose sugar so used shall not be in excess of 11 per cent of the weight of the wine to be fortified under this act: *And provided further*, That the addition of water herein authorized shall be under such regulations and limitations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may from time to time prescribe: *Provided, however*, That records kept in accordance with such regulations as to the percentage of saccharine, acid, alcoholic, and added water content of the wine offered for fortification shall be open to inspection by any official of the Department of Agriculture thereto duly authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture; but in no case shall such wines to which water has been added be eligible for fortification under the provisions of this act, where the same, after fermentation and before fortification, have an alcoholic strength of less than 5 per cent of their volume.

SEC. 45. That under such regulations and official supervision, and upon the execution of such entries and the giving of such bonds, bills of lading, and other security as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, any producer of pure sweet wines as defined by this act may withdraw wine spirits from any special bonded warehouse in original packages or from any registered distillery in any quantity not less than 80 gallons, and may use so much of the same as may be required by him under such regulations, and after the filing of such notices and bonds and the keeping of such records and the rendition of such reports as to materials and products and the disposition of the same as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe in fortifying the pure sweet wines made by him, and for no other purpose, in accordance with the foregoing limitations and provisions; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized whenever he shall deem it to be necessary for the prevention of violations of this law to prescribe that wine spirits withdrawn under this section shall not be used to fortify wines except at a certain distance prescribed by him from any distillery, rectifying house, winery, or other establishment used for producing or storing distilled spirits, or for making or storing wines other than wines which are so fortified, and that in the building in which such fortification of wines is practiced no wines or spirits other than those permitted by this regulation shall be stored in any room or part of the building in which fortification of wines is practiced. The use of wine spirits for the fortification of sweet wines under this act shall be under the immediate supervision of an officer of internal revenue, who shall make returns describing the kinds and quantities of wine so fortified, and shall affix such stamps and seals to the packages containing such wines as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall provide by regulations the time within which wines so fortified with the wine spirits so withdrawn may be subject to inspection, and for final accounting for the use of such wine spirits and for rewarehousing or for payment of the tax on any portion of such wine spirits which remain not used in fortifying pure sweet wines.

SEC. 46. That wine spirits may be withdrawn from special bonded warehouses at the instance of any person desiring to use the same to fortify any wines, in accordance with commercial demands of foreign markets, when such wines are intended for exportation, without the payment of tax on the amount of wine spirits used in such fortification under such regulations and after making such entries and executing and filing with the collector of the district from which the removal is to be made such bonds and bills of lading, and giving such other additional security to prevent the use of such wine spirits free of tax otherwise than in the fortification of wine intended for exportation and for the due exportation of the wine so fortified, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and all of the provisions of law governing the exportation of distilled spirits free of tax, so far as applicable, shall apply to the withdrawal and use of wine spirits and the exportation of the same in accordance with this section; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to prescribe that wine spirits intended for the fortification of wines under this section shall not be introduced into such wines except under the immediate supervision of an officer of internal revenue who shall make returns describing the kinds and quantities of wines so fortified, and shall affix such stamps and seals to the packages containing such wines as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Whenever transportation of such wine is to be effected by land carriage the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe such regulations as to sealing packages and vehicles containing the same, and as to the supervision of transportation from the point of departure, which point shall be determined as the place where such wine spirits may be introduced into such wines, to the point of destination, as may be necessary to insure the due exportation of such fortified wines: *Provided*, That where, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, wines fortified under the provisions of this act with brandy taxable at 55 cents per proof gallon are exported directly from the winery where fortified, there shall be allowed an abatement or refund of tax equivalent to 55 cents per gallon on each proof gallon of wine spirits contained in such wine at the time of export-

tation, which amount of wine spirits shall be ascertained by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under regulations approved by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That such wine spirits on which abatement or refund of tax is allowed shall not exceed the total amount of alcohol in such wine over and above 14 per cent thereof.

"SEC. 49. That wine spirits used in fortifying wines may be recovered from such wines only on the premises of a duly authorized grape-brandy distiller, and for the purpose of such recovery wine so fortified may be received as material on the premises of such a distiller on a special permit of the collector of internal revenue in whose district the distillery is located, and the distiller will be held to pay the tax on the product from such wines as will include both the alcoholic strength therein produced by the fermentation of the grape juice and that obtained from the added wine spirits: *Provided*, That when application for such special permit for redistillation shall be made by the producer of any wines fortified with brandy subject to the tax of 55 cents per proof gallon, before such wine shall have been moved from the premises of the winery where fortified and the redistillation is had under regulations made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, an abatement or refund of the tax assessed against said producer shall be allowed equivalent to 55 cents per proof gallon of brandy contained in said spirits at the time of redistillation, which amount of brandy shall be ascertained by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under regulations approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and wine spirits so recovered may be used in the manner provided by law for the fortification of other wine: *Provided*, That such wine spirits on which abatement or refund of tax is allowed shall not exceed the total amount of alcohol in such wine over and above 14 per cent thereof."

That section 3 and section 6 of the act of June 7, 1906, amending the laws relating to the fortification of pure sweet wines, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized to assign at each winery where wines are to be fortified such number of gaugers or storekeeper gaugers, in the capacity of gaugers, for special duties as may be necessary for the proper supervision of the making and fortifying of such wines, and the compensation of such officers shall not exceed \$5 per diem while so assigned, together with the actual and necessary traveling expenses, and also a reasonable allowance for their board bills, to be fixed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but not to exceed \$2 per diem for said board bills. That bonds hereafter given under the provisions of the aforesaid act of October 1, 1890, as amended, shall be conditioned for the payment of the tax on all brandy removed thereunder and not used and accounted for within the time and in the manner required by law and regulations, and for the payment of all taxes imposed on the brandy so withdrawn and used for fortifications; and the said bonds shall contain such other conditions as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulation prescribe.

"SEC. 6. That any person who by any process recovers from wines fortified under the provisions of the aforesaid act approved October 1, 1890, or amendments thereto, any brandy or wine spirits used in the manufacture or fortification of said wine, otherwise than is provided for in said act and its amendments, or who shall rectify, mix, or compound with distilled spirits or other materials, except as provided in this act, such grape brandy or wine spirits unlawfully recovered therefrom, shall, on conviction, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than \$200 nor more than \$1,000. But the provisions of this section and the provisions of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended, relating to rectification, or other internal-revenue laws of the United States, shall not be held to apply to or prohibit the mixing or blending of pure sweet wines fortified under the provisions of this act with each other or with other wines: *Provided*, That the pure sweet wines fortified under the provisions of this act may be used in the manufacture of cordials, liqueurs, and similar compounds on which an internal-revenue tax of 24 cents a gallon is imposed, and otherwise the provision of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall remain in full force and effect."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow the amendment to go over until to-morrow in order that it may be printed, so that we can read it and see what it is? It is a very long, and it is impossible to form any idea of it from merely hearing it read.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not in control of the bill. I was a member of the subcommittee to which was referred this section relating to wines, and because of that I presume the chairman of the committee asked me to present the amendment; but I am not in control of the bill, and I do not know whether it is agreeable to the chairman of the committee to have the amendment go over.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like very much to have it acted on to-night.

Mr. STONE. If my friend from Washington will permit me, I will say this much to him.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that we might as well act on the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that there has been for many years, as the Senator is doubtless aware, a rather exasperating and hurtful controversy between what may be called the western makers of grape wine, still wines, and what may be called the eastern makers of such wines; that is, those manufacturers who do business this side of the Rocky Mountains. An effort has been made here to amend the wine law, so called, so as to adjust these hurtful differences and bring about a condition of greater equality between all those engaged in this somewhat important industry. To do that it became necessary to amend several sections of the old law relating to the manufacture of still wines.

When we were considering that question we had before us expert officials of the Internal-Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department and also experts employed in the Chemical and

Pure Food Bureau of the Agricultural Department. We conferred with these gentlemen in the preparation of the amendment to the old law and had their assistance and advice. The amendment is not objected to now. It does not interfere with the administration of the law in any way. It is just as easy of administration under the amendment as under the present law. All the people who are engaged in this industry have been represented here in these consultations, and all of them, without exception—that is, the manufacturers of still wines, whether dry or sweet wines—are satisfied with the amendment. They have addressed a letter to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], as chairman of the Finance Committee, which is signed by the authorized representatives of the American Wine Growers' Association, the National Wine Growers' Association, the California Grape Protective Association, and the Mississippi Valley Wine Growers and Grape Growers' Association. These associations all together embrace all the manufacturers of these wines.

It is very desirable that this old controversy should be terminated and the industry put upon a sounder and a more equitable basis. It is believed that this amendment will accomplish that. The amendment is satisfactory to the trade and satisfactory to those who are to administer the law; and since no injury can be done or would be suffered by the Government, since it would heal an old sore, I see no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to.

I wish in this connection to have the letter I have just referred to, addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee, printed as a part of these explanatory remarks. I will not take the time to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, October 14, 1914.

HON. F. M. SIMMONS,

Chairman Finance Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: For many years there has been a universal desire among the grape growers and wine makers of America to standardize the quality of our domestic wines along lines that will permit all sections to make legitimate wines upon terms of equality. We are pleased to state that after several weeks of earnest effort a plan has been worked out covering the making of sweet wines which is satisfactory to every wine-making State in the Union. This plan is found in the proposed bill which was sent to your subcommittee on the 12th instant with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Not only will this measure raise more than the amount of revenue anticipated by your committee from wine sources, but it will permanently settle all sectional differences and contribute materially to the upbuilding of the American wine industry upon a sound basis.

In view of the fact that the American champagne makers are very earnestly representing that their industry will be seriously affected by a tax of 25 cents per quart on champagne wines, we beg to suggest that perhaps this particular rate may be revised without materially affecting the amount of revenue desired or affecting the remainder of the proposed bill. Aside from this item, the undersigned, representing all of the grape-growing States, earnestly ask that the proposed bill be enacted into law, and that, if consistent, an opportunity be afforded them to further present their views to the committee.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERICAN WINE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By HIRAM DEWEY, President.
NATIONAL WINE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By THOS. E. LANNEN, Attorney.
CALIFORNIA GRAPE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
By THEO. A. BELL, Vice Chairman.
THE MISSISSIPPI WINE GROWERS &
GRAPE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By OTTMAR G. STARK, President.
WALTER E. HILDRETH,
Director American Wine Growers' Association.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request just made and address myself to the matter of the amendment.

I am very much obliged to the Senator from Missouri for his very clear general statement as to the purpose and effect of the amendment. I do not know that in behalf of any interest on the Pacific coast anything further need be said on the subject. It was only for the purpose of giving an opportunity for the reading of the amendment, at least, that I made the request of the Senator from Missouri to have it printed so that we would have it on our desks to-morrow and allow action on it to go over until that time.

I do not know what occurred in the Committee on Finance in the consideration of the amendment. Of course, I have the utmost confidence in the Committee on Finance, as the Senate has, but there is no one on that committee from the Pacific coast, which is a great grape-producing country.

Mr. STONE. May I ask the Senator, for information, whether—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Senator whether any considerable amount of still wine is made in Washington?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not any considerable amount in Washington, but a very considerable amount in California.

Mr. STONE. Oh, 90 per cent of it is made in California.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no one from California or from that part of the country on this committee.

Mr. STONE. That is true; but I see one of the Senators from California present. I have not personally conferred with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], but in his presence I will state that representatives of the wine makers of California, among them the vice president of the association there, were present at the time these matters were being considered. The vice president of that association has been in conference with members of the committee, and he, speaking for the wine makers, not only agrees to these amendments to settle these differences; but he is very anxious that they should be agreed to. He signed the letter that I sent to the desk for printing in the RECORD.

The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], who is present, I am sure has been consulted by the people interested.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will say that representative wine growers of California, representing very large areas of land, state that this amendment is satisfactory to them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is a very long amendment. It is equivalent in length to an entire act covering an entire subject. I ask that it go over. I do not like to insist on it unduly, but I shall have to make that request.

Mr. STONE. Personally I should be very glad to accommodate the Senator from Washington about this or anything else. I should, however, very much dislike to see the passage of the bill delayed. I am not in control of it, but I am sure that the Senator from Washington could have no objection to this amendment, since the Treasury officials who are to administer the law are agreeable to it, and since the pure-food bureau of the Government is to have constant access to all the data that the law requires to be kept, and they are to know what is done. It is really an improvement in that respect on the existing law. It is satisfactory to the wine makers of California, as stated on the floor by the Senator from that State who has been in consultation with some of us who have engaged in this work, though not personally with me. Ninety per cent of this still wine is made in California, and the accredited representatives of those people are favorable to the amendment. I can not, therefore, understand why anybody else should object to it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There might not be any reason to object, and there might not be any objection. The basis on which I am making my request is not that there is any objection to the amendment. What I am making my request for is in order that we may have an opportunity to read the amendment before we are called upon to vote on it.

I have no doubt that what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] says is true, but the Senate and all the interests concerned at least ought to have an opportunity of knowing what we are acting upon. There are other amendments, I assume, which the committee has that could be presented to the Senate to occupy the time of the Senate for the remainder of this day. I do not think my request that the amendment go over is an unreasonable one.

Mr. STONE. I will say that, if the Senator from Washington, after the matter is printed in the RECORD in the morning, looks the amendment over and feels that any part of it ought to be reconsidered, I would offer no objection to doing that, and that he might be heard in opposition, if he wishes to do so, by way of amendment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is exceedingly liberal of the Senator to allow another Senator an opportunity to be heard upon the matter before it is acted upon; but I had rather have the opportunity of doing that without having it conceded to me.

Mr. STONE. For the information of the Senator from Washington and of the Senate, I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a memorandum of the wine sections, giving the effect of these amendments on the various sections amended, and let it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

MEMORANDUM—WINE SECTION WAR-REVENUE BILL.

Estimated revenue:	
Still wines, 45,000,000 gallons, at 6 cents	\$2,700,000
Champagnes, 300,000 cases, at \$3	900,000
Carbonated wines, 15,000 cases, at \$1.20	18,000
Cordials, 10,000,000 gallons, at 24 cents	2,400,000
Grape brandy, 3,000,000 gallons, at 55 per cent	1,650,000
	7,668,000

Proposed changes in sweet-wine law of October 1, 1890, and act of June 7, 1906.

1. By imposing a tax of 55 cents per gallon on wine spirits used in fortifying sweet wines, instead of 3 cents per gallon now imposed, same to be paid within three months after notice of assessment.
2. Amending section 42 by omitting—
 - (a) Words "who is also a distiller."
 - (b) Reference to preservation of saccharine matter.
 - (c) Fourteen per cent limitation as to brandy to be used, but retaining the 24 per cent limitation.
 - (d) Limitation of fortifying period.
3. Amending section 43—
 - (a) By striking out requirement as to 4 per cent sugar.
 - (b) By allowing use of commercial brandy.
 - (c) By increasing added sugar from 10 per cent now limited in act to 11 per cent.
 - (d) By substituting "dextrose" for "anhydrous" sugar, for greater certainty of name.
 - (e) By allowing water to be used for ameliorating or mechanical purposes under regulations and limitations to be presented by Internal Revenue Department.
 - (f) All records of ingredients contained in or added to wines to be open to inspection of Department of Agriculture.
4. Amending section 45—
 - (a) By eliminating requirement that fortification shall be at vineyard of the wine maker.
5. Amending section 46—
 - (a) By permitting wines for export to be fortified at winery, instead of alongside of exporting vessel, as now required.
 - (b) By providing for an allowance of drawback on exported wines in which tax-paid brandy has been used.
6. Amending section 49—
 - (a) By providing for an allowance on account of tax paid on brandy used in fortifying wines and subsequently recovered by wine maker before the fortified wines leave his premises.
7. Amending section 3, act of June 7, 1906—
 - (a) By providing for bonds securing payment of tax on brandy used in fortifying wines.
8. Amending section 6, act of June 7, 1906—
 - (a) By extending the provisions of that section exempting from special tax as rectifiers persons who use fortified wine "in the manufacture of cordials, liquors, or similar compounds, upon which a tax is paid," and allowing blending of wines.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Washington will let us act on the matter to-night. If on to-morrow he feels that he desires to be heard on it, he can then be heard.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible for me to state, Mr. President, whether—

Mr. STONE. Of course; but the Senator can read the amendment in the morning, if he wishes, before we meet. That is what he would have to do anyway, whether the amendment went over or not. I merely want to get ahead with the bill. The Senator from Washington loses no right under my proposition, and I am sure he will not want to interpose in the way of the obstruction of this legislation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, the discussion of the suggestion which I have made is likely to occupy considerable more time than would be occupied in action upon the amendment if we had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. STONE. Why would it take any more time?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the reason that I consider the request which I made of the Senator from Missouri an extremely reasonable one.

Mr. STONE. Except that it delays the passage of the bill; that is the only thing.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The passage of bills ought to be delayed long enough for Senators to see what they are voting upon. There is no Senator in the Senate who has not previously considered this matter who can state what it contains or what its effect will be from merely hearing it read by the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have made about all the appeal I can, and I have offered, I think, a very fair solution of this question to the Senator from Washington. If he is not disposed to accept the suggestion, I am at my row's end. I have no authority to postpone the consideration of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri—

Mr. STONE. I beg the Chair's pardon. The Senator did not ask unanimous consent. He asked the Senator from Missouri to pass the amendment over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Washington had asked the Senate to have the amendment go over, and was appealing to the Senator from Missouri to acquiesce.

Mr. STONE. There is no need of our wasting time on that. The Senator from Washington made his appeal to me, as I understood him, and I said that I could not accede to it without the consent of the chairman of the committee; and that, without that consent, I should have to object to the amendment going over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which has been offered and is now pending be printed for the use of the Senate, and that its consideration be postponed until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and that its consideration be postponed until to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to object, but I think we ought to go on with this bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think so myself; I agree with the Senator from North Carolina. That is why I think he ought to concede the request which I have made. The amendment going over will not delay the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from North Carolina does not object, I shall not do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, what was the request? I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has given unanimous consent to the amendment going over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not object to the amendment going over.

Mr. JONES. I desire to ask unanimous consent, probably out of order, to offer an amendment, so that it may be printed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 11 I move to strike out all after the second line on that page and all of the next page down to line 3 and insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator's amendment include striking out line 3, on page 12?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out:

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales do not exceed 50,000 pounds shall each pay \$6.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 50,000 and do not exceed 100,000 pounds shall each pay \$12.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 100,000 pounds and do not exceed 200,000 shall each pay \$24.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 200,000 and do not exceed 400,000 pounds shall each pay \$48.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 400,000 pounds shall each pay \$96.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales do not exceed 100,000 cigars shall each pay \$6.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 100,000 and do not exceed 200,000 cigars shall each pay \$12.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 200,000 cigars and do not exceed 400,000 shall each pay \$24.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 400,000 and do not exceed 750,000 cigars shall each pay \$48.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 750,000 cigars shall each pay \$96.

Manufacturers of cigarettes shall each pay \$24.

And insert:

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales do not exceed 100,000 pounds shall each pay \$6.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 100,000 and do not exceed 200,000 pounds shall each pay \$12.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 200,000 and do not exceed 400,000 pounds shall each pay \$24.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 400,000 and do not exceed 1,000,000 pounds shall each pay \$60.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 1,000,000 and do not exceed 5,000,000 pounds shall each pay \$300.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 5,000,000 and do not exceed 10,000,000 pounds shall each pay \$600.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 10,000,000 and do not exceed 20,000,000 pounds shall each pay \$1,200.

Manufacturers of tobacco whose annual sales exceed 20,000,000 pounds shall each pay \$2,496.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales do not exceed 100,000 cigars shall each pay \$3.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 100,000 and do not exceed 200,000 cigars shall each pay \$6.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 200,000 and do not exceed 400,000 cigars shall each pay \$12.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 400,000 and do not exceed 1,000,000 cigars shall each pay \$30.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 1,000,000 and do not exceed 5,000,000 cigars shall each pay \$150.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 5,000,000 and do not exceed 20,000,000 cigars shall each pay \$600.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 20,000,000 and do not exceed 40,000,000 cigars shall each pay \$1,200.

Manufacturers of cigars whose annual sales exceed 40,000,000 cigars shall each pay \$2,496.

Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales do not exceed 1,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$12.

Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 1,000,000 and do not exceed 2,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$24.

Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 2,000,000 and do not exceed 5,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$60.

Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 5,000,000 and do not exceed 10,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$120.
Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 10,000,000 and do not exceed 50,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$600.
Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 50,000,000 and do not exceed 100,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$1,200.
Manufacturers of cigarettes whose annual sales exceed 100,000,000 cigarettes shall each pay \$2,496.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are very few Senators present at this time, and that is a most radical change in the bill as reported to the Senate. I know nothing about the effect of the amendment, and I ask the Senator if he will not allow it to be printed and go over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will suggest to the Senator that there is nothing new in the principle involved in the amendment the committee has offered.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be true, but when a tax is raised from \$96 to \$2,496, it seems to me that it ought at least to receive some consideration by Senators whose States are interested in the production of tobacco and in the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes.

Mr. SIMMONS. This amendment does not affect the production of tobacco, but only its manufacture.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not mean the tobacco itself, but I meant in the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he has made any computation as to the amount which it is expected to obtain by this assessment?

Mr. SIMMONS. The amount of revenue?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; the amount of revenue on this new basis.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not give a definite answer, but I think up to the classification of \$1,200 it was estimated that there would be about \$200,000 increase in revenue.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The amendment proposes a very radical change.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am advised that it will increase the revenue with the additional classifications which have been up to \$2,496, about \$467,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Would that be the total revenue derived from this particular schedule?

Mr. SIMMONS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What would be the total revenue under this particular schedule, according to the amendment just proposed by the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SIMMONS. About \$4,900,000 was the amount estimated before the classification proposed by the amendment. The new classification would add \$467,000, so that the total, as I run the figures out, would be about \$5,300,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the total?

Mr. SIMMONS. That would include the tax on retail dealers, on the dealers in leaf tobacco, and on the manufacturers.

Mr. SMOOT. The report from the Secretary of the Treasury shows that the estimated revenue, including the tax on dealers in tobacco, would be \$4,800,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no change as to the tax on dealers?

Mr. SIMMONS. No change in that respect at all.

Mr. SMOOT. That report also shows that from the tax on manufacturers of tobacco the estimated revenue was only \$47,000. With this amendment what would it amount to?

Mr. SIMMONS. To \$467,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Or an increase of about \$420,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. What would it be including the manufacturers of cigars?

Mr. SIMMONS. The figures I stated included the manufacturers of tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes.

Mr. SMOOT. It can not be that; it must be \$467,000 increase.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; if the Senator will permit me, I think I can explain the matter in a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment. I will say to the Senator that the estimated revenue from manufacturers of tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes as reported to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury is \$357,000. If the Senator from North Caro-

lina is correct, the estimates now on the amendment just proposed is \$467,000, or an increase of only \$110,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; that is based upon a maximum of \$1,200. That maximum, I think, since that estimate, has been raised to \$2,496. I have no estimate as to that under the last classification.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator once more, so that I may get a full understanding of it, what is the estimated revenue from the manufacturers of tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes under the amendment just offered by the Senator?

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought I stated that to the Senator. Perhaps I made a mistake. The estimated income is \$467,000, without the addition of the last classification.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh! Then, of course, it is an increase of even more than \$467,000. That is what I thought when I made the latter statement—that it was an increase, and not the amount of tax.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What I wanted to suggest to the Senator was that this last classification does not add a very large amount of revenue, because it probably will apply only to 8 or 10 dealers in the country. What I furthermore wanted to impress upon the Senator was that these enlarged taxes upon the large dealers are still far below the pro rata tax which the small dealers are paying. The small dealer who pays \$96 for the privilege of selling over 400,000 pounds of tobacco a year will be paying about five times as much tax as the large dealer who pays \$2,496. In other words, large as this highest tax is, it is still about only one-fifth the pro rata tax paid by the small dealer; and it is in an effort to equalize these taxes upon the cost of doing business that the committee has consented to make this amendment.

My own judgment is that the change should have gone much further, and that the tax should have been much larger, so that the large dealer should pay as much in proportion as the small one. As the Senator says, however, it is a change from the past, and for that reason the committee has been overconservative.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I myself believe, figuring the sales of the small manufacturer and those of the large manufacturer, pro rata, the \$96 would be perhaps just as much in comparison for the small dealer as the \$2,496 for the larger dealer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; it is five times as much. I have computed it, and the small dealer will still pay five times as much in proportion to his business as the large dealer; so that this is not a radical or unreasonable increase on the large dealer. Instead of being \$2,496 it ought to be much more than twice that amount in order to compel the large dealer to pay in proportion to the small dealer. It is a reform in the direction of justice. It is a reform in the direction of fair play, toward equalizing the burden of this tax.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I caught the amendment, it is a reduction on the small dealer and small manufacturer from the rate proposed in the original bill?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is. It starts with a reduction; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I judged so, just from hearing the amendment read; but I was not particularly interested at this time in the question whether it was too small or too great. I simply asked that it go over and be printed, because it was such a radical change; and as a number of Senators from States that would be particularly interested in this matter are absent I thought it would be nothing more than fair to have it go over until to-morrow morning and allow the amendment to be printed, and then they can see for themselves how it would affect their own States.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator insists, let it go over, and we will take it up to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from North Carolina, so that the Record may be straight, that the committee amendment on page 11, lines 11, 12, and 13, was agreed to, and I believe—

Mr. SIMMONS. That will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe that would have to be reconsidered before the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will make that motion in the morning. The Senator is right about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not make that motion now?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I will make it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Beginning on page 26, sections 19, 20, 21, and 22, all being amendments offered by the committee, were passed over on yesterday at the request, I think, of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. At the time I made the request for the passing over of those sections I thought they referred to proprietary medicines, and I had not the time to read them. It was for that purpose only that I asked to have them go over.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for action upon them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendments constituting sections 19, 20, 21, and 22.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 3, section 2 was passed over for the purpose of rewriting the so-called wine amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is pending.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for the adoption of the committee amendment striking out those lines on page 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out lines 6 to 24, both inclusive, on page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 7, paragraph "Fourth" was passed over at the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I should very much prefer to take up the amendments I have to offer for consideration after all of the amendments of the committee have been disposed of. My object in asking that that paragraph be passed over was to offer an amendment; but really there was no necessity for its going over, because there is no amendment to the House provision. So the Senator need not consider that item at this time; but I will offer an amendment after the committee amendments are all disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; that is agreed to, as I understand, subject to amendment by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from North Carolina the advisability of having the bill reprinted with the amendments that have been adopted, so that we can see to-morrow exactly what amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to that, if the Senator will let me finish these other matters.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 9, paragraph "Tenth," that amendment was passed over, also. That is an amendment passed over at the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I wanted to consider that amendment of the committee in connection with the item of commercial brokers, because I think they ought to be considered together. Does the Senator desire to consider them now?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator has not his amendment prepared, and wishes time to prepare it—

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I would very much prefer to have it go over, and consider the two together, because I think that is the only proper way to do.

Mr. SIMMONS. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 25, there is a committee amendment, beginning after the figures "\$10,000," in line 6, that has not been acted upon. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, line 6, after the numerals "\$10,000," it is proposed to insert "mutual ditch or irrigating companies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Are those all the amendments the Senator desires to offer to section 16?

Mr. SIMMONS. Those are all the amendments we have to offer to that section.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I shall offer an amendment to that section after the Senator has concluded his amendments.

Mr. SIMMONS. All right. On page 32, the paragraph beginning at line 19 was passed over. It was passed over for the purpose of an amendment, I think. That amendment has been offered and acted upon.

Mr. SMOOT. That was passed over, so as to offer an amendment to the paragraph in relation to the tax upon grain.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have offered an amendment, which the Senate has adopted, which I think is satisfactory all around.

The Senator from Minnesota has examined it, and the Senator from North Dakota has examined it, and I think they are satisfied.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from North Dakota are satisfied with the amendment that has already been offered, I shall say no more about it, because that was the amendment that I intended to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands no amendment has been offered.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has been offered and adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair means, to the section which the Senator from Utah is now discussing.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; not to the one that is now being discussed.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there was a committee amendment offered to the section, beginning on page 32, line 19, after the word "court"; and now I understand the Senator from North Carolina to say that that amendment was perfectly satisfactory to the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think I am talking about the same amendment that the Senator from Utah is talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; that is the amendment. It was put in at the suggestion of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will not ask that it be read. I am satisfied if it is satisfactory to those Senators.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to see that I am talking about the same one. Yes; that is the same amendment. Now, on page 35—

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. He is not in the Chamber just at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will let it go over, in his absence. On page 37—

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well. On page 39, lines 11 to 19—

Mr. SMOOT. I believe I asked that the insurance item, on page 39, might be passed over, but the committee offered the amendment that I intended to offer to that paragraph.

Mr. SIMMONS. There are two amendments to that paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. I say, the committee offered the one that I intended to offer. That was all I intended to do.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, I ask for the adoption of those two amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 39, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the proviso, running down to the word "That," in line 19, as follows:

That whenever a policy is canceled or returned or a premium is returned or refunded, in whole or in part, the tax upon such unearned returned or refunded premium or part thereof shall be repaid pro rata to the person, association, or corporation paying the same. Statements verified by some officer of the company or companies availing themselves of this provision shall be made and filed with the collector of the proper district every 30 days, setting forth the items upon which such refund is to be made: *Provided further*.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, line 23, after the word "Provided," it is proposed to insert a colon and the words:

And provided further, That policies of reinsurance shall be exempt from the tax herein imposed by this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 41—

Mr. SMOOT. The paragraph on page 41 in relation to passenger tickets has been amended by the committee in part as I intended to offer the amendment, but as to the balance of the paragraph I will offer amendments as soon as the committee amendments are disposed of, for they apply only to the House provision.

Mr. SIMMONS. The committee offered amendments to that paragraph to-day, which have been adopted; but there is one amendment which has been heretofore offered by the committee, beginning after "\$5," on line 14, which has not yet been adopted, and I move the adoption of that amendment now.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right, Mr. President.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, line 14, after "\$5," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That such passage tickets costing \$10 or less shall be exempt from taxation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. On behalf of the committee I desire to offer an amendment. On page 34, line 7, after the word "transporta-

tion," I move to insert "when a charge exceeding 5 cents is made."

Mr. SIMMONS. On behalf of the Committee on Finance I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, that the revenue bill be reprinted, showing all the amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator would include in that the printing of the bill with the amendments offered as to tobacco and wine which have not been acted upon by the Senate?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think probably, after reflection, it would be better not to print the tobacco and the wine amendments in the bill, but to print them as separate amendments proposed by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, that course will be taken.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed tax on automobiles, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the French Creek Baptist Association of Pennsylvania, of Meadville, Pa., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Lock Haven, Pa., praying for the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of the drug-trade section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the commercial brokers of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the internal-revenue bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WEEKS (for Mr. SHERMAN) presented a memorial of the Rock Island County Retail Druggists' Association, of Illinois, remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines, which was ordered to lie on the table.

DRESS AND WAIST INDUSTRY.

Mr. FLETCHER. On the 14th instant the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] presented a report prepared by N. I. Stone, chief statistician of the wage-scale board of the Dress and Waist Industry of New York City, and it was referred to the Committee on Printing for action. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 473) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by Mr. SMOOT on October 14, 1914, entitled "Wages, Regularity of Employment, and Standardization of Piece Rates in the Dress and Waist Industry of New York City," by N. I. Stone, chief statistician of the wage-scale board of the dress and waist industry, be printed as a Senate document.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE SENATOR JOHN T. MORGAN.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. From the Committee on the Library I report back favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 196) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the Southern Commercial Congress to place a tablet at Gamboa, Canal Zone, as a memorial to the late Senator

John T. Morgan, and I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution. It will take but a moment to dispose of it.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments of the Committee on the Library were, in line 3, after the words "placing of," to strike out the words "the said" and insert the letter "a", and in line 4, after the word "tablet," to insert "containing an appropriate bust of the late Senator John T. Morgan with an appropriate inscription," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas the Southern Commercial Congress, on November 7, 1913, dedicated the bluff at Gamboa, in the Canal Zone, near the north entrance to Culebra Cut, as the site for placing a memorial tablet to the memory of the late Senator John T. Morgan, of Alabama; and Whereas preparations have been made for placing the tablet containing a medallion bust of the late Senator Morgan and a legend reciting his leadership in keeping alive in the Congress of the United States the question of an interoceanic canal: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That permission is hereby granted for the placing of a tablet containing an appropriate bust of the late Senator John T. Morgan, with an appropriate inscription, at Gamboa, in the Canal Zone, at such time and under such regulations as the Secretary of War may direct.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the preamble be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble will be stricken out.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

Mr. STONE. The bill (S. 5614) for the improvement of the foreign service is on the calendar. I should like very much to have it acted upon. I will say to the Senate that there are rather urgent reasons why the measure should be disposed of favorably.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the bill?

Mr. STONE. It is a bill classifying the secretaries of embassies and legations and those in the Consular Service and providing for transfers by the department.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments were to strike out sections 6 and 7 of the bill and to change the numbering of section 8 to section 6, the numbering of section 9 to section 7, and the numbering of section 10 to section 8, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all appointments of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls general and consuls shall be by commission to the offices of secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, or consul, and not by commission to any particular post, and that such officers shall be assigned to posts and transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require: *Provided*, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interest demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period of not to exceed one year, and no longer.

SEC. 2. That secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and consuls general and consuls shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows, with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto.

SECRETARIES.

Secretary of class 1, \$3,000.
Secretary of class 2, \$2,625.
Secretary of class 3, \$2,000.
Secretary of class 4, \$1,500.
Secretary of class 5, \$1,200.

CONSULS GENERAL.

Consul general of class 1, \$12,000.
Consul general of class 2, \$8,000.
Consul general of class 3, \$6,000.
Consul general of class 4, \$5,500.
Consul general of class 5, \$4,500.

CONSULS.

Consul of class 1, \$8,000.
Consul of class 2, \$6,000.
Consul of class 3, \$5,000.
Consul of class 4, \$4,500.
Consul of class 5, \$4,000.
Consul of class 6, \$3,500.
Consul of class 7, \$3,000.
Consul of class 8, \$2,500.
Consul of class 9, \$2,000.

SEC. 3. That section 1685 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1685. That for such time as any secretary of embassy or legation shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his salary as secretary of embassy or legation, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per centum of the salary provided by law for the ambassador or minister at such post; and for such time as any vice consul shall be lawfully authorized to assume charge of a consulate general or consulate during the absence of the principal officer at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his regular salary or compensation as a subordinate con-

sular officer or employee, compensation equal to the difference between such salary or compensation and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the principal consular officer at such post."

SEC. 4. That a secretary, consul general, or consul of whatever class detailed for special duty outside of the city of Washington shall be paid his actual and necessary expenses for subsistence during such special detail: *Provided*, That such special duty shall not continue for more than 60 days unless in the case of international gatherings, congresses, or conferences, when such subsistence expenses shall run only during the life of the international gathering, congress, or conference, as the case may be.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations for promotion or for transfer between the department and the foreign service, the names of those secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and the names of those consular officers or departmental officers or employees who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon examination to have fitness for appointment to the lower grades of the service.

SEC. 6. That section 1674 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1674. That the official designations employed throughout this title shall be deemed to have the following meanings, respectively:

"First. 'Consul general' and 'consul' shall be deemed to denote full, principal, and permanent consular officers as distinguished from subordinates and substitutes.

"Second. 'Consular agent' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising the powers vested in them and performing the duties prescribed for them by regulation of the President at posts or places different from those at which such principals are located, respectively.

"Third. 'Vice consuls' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising and performing the duties within the limits of their consulates at the same or at different points and places from those at which the principals are located, except that when vice consuls take charge of consulates general or consulates when the principal officers shall be temporarily absent or relieved from duty they shall be deemed to denote consular officers who shall be substituted, temporarily, to fill the places of said consuls general or consuls.

"Fourth. 'Consular officer' shall be deemed to include consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, interpreters in consular offices, student interpreters, and consular agents, and none others.

"Fifth. 'Diplomatic officer' shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, chargés d'affaires, agents, secretaries of embassy and legation, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, and none others.

The offices of vice consul general, deputy consul general, and deputy consul are abolished.

SEC. 7. That no ambassador, minister, minister resident, diplomatic agent, or secretary in the Diplomatic Service of any grade or class shall, while he holds his office, be interested in or transact any business as a merchant, factor, broker, or other trader, or as an agent for any such person, to, from, or within the country or countries to which he or the chief of his mission, as the case may be, is accredited, either in his own name or in the name or through the agency of any other person, nor shall he, in such country or countries, practice as a lawyer for compensation or be interested in the fees or compensation of any lawyer so practicing.

SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect on the 30th day of September, 1914, when all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I would like to offer an amendment. At the end of section 1, line 2, page 2, I move to strike out the period after the word "longer" and insert a colon and then these words:

Provided further, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher class except upon the nomination of the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. STONE. On the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I will change it so as to read "shall not be promoted to a higher class or demoted to a lower class."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 2, after the word "longer" and before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher or demoted to a lower class except upon the nomination of the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah does not insist upon his amendment, so the part relating to demotion may go out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified by the omission of the words "or demoted to a lower."

Mr. STONE. Then it simply relates to promotions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. ADAMS.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report favorably from the Committee on Indian Affairs the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 362) to correct an error in the enrollment of certain Indians enumerated in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, enacted into law in the Indian appropriation act approved August 1, 1914.

It is a very short resolution. It simply purposes to change a name in the last Indian appropriation act. A large number of Indians were placed upon the roll as entitled to enrollment, and among them some Mississippi Choctaws, 21 in number, but the name of one of them was erroneously placed on the roll as Mitchell C. Adams, when it should have been William C. Adams. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to substitute the name of William C. Adams in place of Mitchell C. Adams, jr., in the list of Mississippi Choctaw Indians enumerated in Senate document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, which Indians so enumerated in said document were authorized to be enrolled on the respective rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes by section 17, paragraph 9, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved August 1, 1914.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 6640) granting an increase of pension to Charles Pettys; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6641) to transfer Capt. John Calvin Leonard from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

T. S. WILLIAMS.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of T. S. Williams having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$261"; and the House agree to the same.

N. P. BRYAN,

BLAIR LEE,

G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD W. POU,

H. D. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FREDERICK J. ERNST.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

N. P. BRYAN,

FRANK S. WHITE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD W. POU,

H. D. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 18459. An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., Thursday, October 15, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, October 16, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, October 15, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great Father soul, in whose all-embracing love we live and move and have our being, increase our faith and confidence in Thee, and teach us how to think great thoughts, to live noble lives, to grow old gracefully, to die peacefully, looking forward to the larger life which Thou hast prepared for Thy children, that we may honor ourselves and hallow Thy name. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves the approval of the Journal.

The Journal was approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, the Speaker of the House, at the opening of the campaign in New Jersey last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech that I made at Atlantic City last night—

Mr. BUTLER. Last night?

The SPEAKER. Saturday night.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not object to that one. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, the previous order of the House as to Calendar Wednesday to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the Alaskan coal bill, notwithstanding that this is constructively Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Printing, which has the right of way on Calendar Wednesday—that is to-day—has agreed to permit the consideration of this bill without demanding the regular order, because it believes that it is really emergent legislation, and therefore I shall not object to this request, with the understanding that immediately after the consideration of this bill the regular order will be requested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much time for debate can we agree upon?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think there is any disposition on this side to hurry the matter or attempt to shut anyone off. I do not propose to use much time myself.

Mr. MANN. I will be perfectly frank with the House. There are two or three gentlemen who wish to be heard for a short time, I think, not on this bill. I wondered if we could agree on some time for length of debate on the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there should be some understanding as to the exact amount of time to be used. If it comes out of the time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], he is more concerned than anybody else.

Mr. BARNHART. If there is a disposition to indulge in general debate, I wish to say that the consideration of the printing bill is now nearing its close, and the committee would certainly like to finish it after these many weeks of consideration. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not desire to inject general debate into this bill. I trust there will be no general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that when this bill is out of the way—and the printing bill can not go over until to-morrow—so far as I am concerned, if the gentleman desires to secure reasonable opportunity for general debate to-morrow morning, I shall have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself shall each have control of an hour to-morrow for general debate after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a moment, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I understand there will be a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules to-morrow to take up this matter concerning the Board of Governors of the Soldiers' Home. I do not see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT] just now, but I understand that that measure will probably require half an hour for debate; so that I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would be willing to have that matter considered first, and then have the general debate he desires afterwards?

Mr. MANN. I would not have any objection to that, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman made his request as applying immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I could not put it otherwise, because there is no certainty that the rule will be reported. It will be subject to the report of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. What is the request?

Mr. MANN. That the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself each have control of one hour's time to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal, subject to the right of the Committee on Rules to bring in the rule referred to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of the rule, if reported, he and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] shall each have an hour on the Alaskan coal bill.

Mr. MANN. No; on anything—general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; general debate.

Mr. MANN. Each to control an hour's time.

The SPEAKER. Is not this a conference report?

Mr. MANN. We will dispose of that now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the action of the House on this conference report, the gentleman from Illinois had indicated that he desires some time for general debate on that side of the House, and I have suggested to him that he can take that up to-morrow; and out of that suggestion has grown his request.

The SPEAKER. All right. The request is that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of the rule concerning the Board of Governors of the Soldiers' Home, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] shall each have control of an hour for general debate. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] for the present consideration of the conference report on the Alaskan coal bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the conference report and that the report be printed in the Record.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the statement is much longer than the conference report. I think the statement would not be as clear as the report.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1186.)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14223) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to survey the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska known to be valuable for their deposits of coal, preference to be given first in favor of surveying lands within those areas commonly known as the Bering River, Matanuska, and Nenana coal fields, and thereafter to such areas or coal fields as lie tributary to established settlements or existing or proposed rail or water transportation lines: *Provided*, That such surveys shall be executed in accordance with existing laws and rules and regulations governing the survey of public lands. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of making the surveys herein provided for, to

continue available until expended: *Provided*, That any surveys heretofore made under the authority or by the approval of the Department of the Interior may be adopted and used for the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 2. That the President of the United States shall designate and reserve from use, location, sale, lease, or disposition not exceeding 5,120 acres of coal-bearing land in the Bering River field and not exceeding 7,680 acres of coal-bearing land in the Matanuska field, and not to exceed one-half of the other coal lands in Alaska: *Provided*, That the coal deposits in such reserved areas may be mined under the direction of the President when, in his opinion, the mining of such coal in such reserved areas, under the direction of the President, becomes necessary, by reason of an insufficient supply of coal at a reasonable price for the requirements of Government works, construction and operation of Government railroads, for the Navy, for national protection, or for relief from monopoly or oppressive conditions.

"Sec. 3. That the unreserved coal lands and coal deposits shall be divided by the Secretary of the Interior into leasing blocks or tracts of 40 acres each, or multiples thereof, and in such form as in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the most economical mining of the coal in such blocks, but in no case exceeding 2,560 acres in any one leasing block or tract; and thereafter, the Secretary shall offer such blocks or tracts and the coal, lignite, and associated minerals therein for leasing, and may award leases thereof through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations adopt, to any person above the age of 21 years who is a citizen of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation or municipality organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof: *Provided*, That a majority of the stock of such corporation shall at all times be owned and held by citizens of the United States: *And provided further*, That no railroad or common carrier shall be permitted to take or acquire through lease or permit under this act any coal or coal lands in excess of such area or quantity as may be required and used solely for its own use, and such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder: *And provided further*, That any person, association, or corporation qualified to become a lessee under this act and owning any pending claim under the public-land laws to any coal lands in Alaska may, within one year from the passage of this act, enter into an arrangement with the Secretary of the Interior by which such claim shall be fully relinquished to the United States; and if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the circumstances connected with such claim justify so doing the moneys paid by the claimant or claimants to the United States on account of such claim shall, by direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be returned and paid over to such person, association, or corporation as a consideration for such relinquishment.

"All claims of existing rights to any of such lands in which final proof has been submitted and which are now pending before the Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior for decision shall be adjudicated within one year from the passage of this act.

"Sec. 4. That a person, association, or corporation holding a lease of coal lands under this act may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and through the same procedure and upon the same terms and conditions as in the case of an original lease under this act, secure a further or new lease covering additional lands contiguous to those embraced in the original lease, but in no event shall the total area embraced in such original and new leases exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres.

"That upon satisfactory showing by any lessee to the Secretary of the Interior that all of the workable deposits of coal within a tract covered by his or its lease will be exhausted, worked out, or removed within three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, within his discretion, lease to such lessee an additional tract of land or coal deposits, which, including the coal area remaining in the original lease, shall not exceed 2,560 acres, through the same procedure and under the same competitive conditions as in case of an original lease.

"Sec. 5. That, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, lessees holding under leases small blocks or areas may consolidate their said leases or holdings so as to include in a single holding not to exceed 2,560 acres of contiguous lands.

"Sec. 6. That each lease shall be for such leasing block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the subdivisions of the survey, and no person, association, or corporation, except as hereinafter provided, shall be permitted to take or hold any interest as a stockholder or otherwise in more than one such lease under this act, and any interest held in violation of this

proviso shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

"Sec. 7. That any person who shall purchase, acquire, or hold any interest in two or more such leases, except as herein provided, or who shall knowingly purchase, acquire, or hold any stock in a corporation having an interest in two or more such leases, or who shall knowingly sell or transfer to one disqualified to purchase, or except as in this act specifically provided, disqualified to acquire any such interest, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and by a fine not exceeding \$1,000: *Provided*, That any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held two years after its acquisition and not longer, and in case of minority or other disability such time as the court may decree.

"Sec. 8. That any director, trustee, officer, or agent of any corporation holding any interest in such a lease who shall, on behalf of such corporation, act in the purchase of any interest in another lease, or who shall knowingly act on behalf of such corporation in the sale or transfer of any such interest in any lease held by such corporation to any corporation or individual holding any interest in any such a lease, except as herein provided, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for a term of not exceeding three years and a fine of not exceeding \$1,000.

"Sec. 8a. If any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this act shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with consent of lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, entered into by the lessee, or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control, in excess of 2,500 acres in the Territory of Alaska, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings.

"Sec. 9. That for the privilege of mining and extracting and disposing of the coal in the lands covered by his lease the lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall not be less than 2 cents per ton, due and payable at the end of each month succeeding that of the shipment of the coal from the mine, and an annual rental, payable at the beginning of each year, on the lands covered by such lease, at the rate of 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, and \$1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for any year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases may be for periods of not more than 50 years each, subject to renewal, on such terms and conditions as may be authorized by law at the time of such renewal. All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska Fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

"Sec. 10. That in order to provide for the supply of strictly local and domestic needs for fuel the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe in advance, issue to any applicant qualified under section 3 of this act a limited license or permit granting the right to prospect for, mine, and dispose of coal belonging to the United States on specified tracts not to exceed 10 acres to any one person or association of persons in any one coal field for a period of not exceeding 10 years, on such conditions not inconsistent with this act as in his opinion will safeguard the public interest, without payment of royalty for the coal mined or for the land occupied: *Provided*, That the acquisition or holding of a lease under the preceding sections of this act shall be no bar to the acquisition, holding, or operating under the limited license in this section permitted. And the holding of such a license shall be no bar to the acquisition or holding of such a lease or interest therein.

"Sec. 11. That any lease, entry, location, occupation, or use permitted under this act shall reserve to the Government of the United States the right to grant or use such easements in, over,

through, or upon the land leased, entered, located, occupied, or used as may be necessary or appropriate to the working of the same or other coal lands by or under authority of the Government and for other purposes: *Provided*, That said Secretary, in his discretion, in making any lease under this act, may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted in so far as said surface is not necessary for use by the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits of coal therein. If such reservation is made, it shall be so determined before the offering of such lease.

"That the said Secretary during the life of the lease is authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved, and to permit the use of such other public lands in the Territory of Alaska as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of coal washeries or other works incident to the mining or treatment of coal, which lands may be occupied and used jointly or severally by lessees or permittees, as may be determined by said Secretary.

"Sec. 12. That no lease issued under authority of this act shall be assigned or sublet except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Each lease shall contain provisions for the purpose of insuring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of said property, and for the safety and welfare of the miners and for the prevention of undue waste, including a restriction of the workday to not exceeding eight hours in any one day for underground workers except in cases of emergency; provisions securing the workers complete freedom of purchase, requiring the payment of wages at least twice a month in lawful money of the United States, and providing proper rules and regulations to secure fair and just weighing or measurement of the coal mined by each miner, and such other provisions as are needed for the protection of the interests of the United States, for the prevention of monopoly, and for the safeguarding of the public welfare.

"Sec. 13. That the possession of any lessee of the land or coal deposits leased under this act for all purposes involving adverse claims to the leased property shall be deemed the possession of the United States, and for such purposes the lessee shall occupy the same relation to the property leased as if operated directly by the United States.

"Sec. 14. That any such lease may be forfeited and canceled by appropriate proceeding in a court of competent jurisdiction whenever the lessee fails to comply with any provision of the lease or of general regulations promulgated under this act; and the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

"Sec. 15. That on and after the approval of this act no lands in Alaska containing deposits of coal withdrawn from entry or sale shall be disposed of or acquired in any manner except as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not affect any proceeding now pending in the Department of the Interior, and any such proceeding may be carried to a final determination in said department notwithstanding the passage hereof: *Provided further*, That no lease shall be made, under the provisions hereof, of any land, a claim for which is pending in the Department of the Interior at the date of the passage of this act, until and unless such claim is finally disposed of by the department adversely to the claimant.

"Sec. 16. That all statements, representations, or reports required, unless otherwise specified, by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be upon oath and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require, and any person making false oath, representation, or report shall be subject to punishment as for perjury.

"Sec. 17. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 18. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SCOTT FERRIS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,
Managers on the part of the House.
H. L. MYERS,
WM. H. THOMPSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

Section 1 of the bill as agreed to in conference authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to survey and lease the coal lands in

Alaska, giving preference, so far as early surveys are concerned, to the three main fields, to wit, the Bering River field, the Matanuska field, and the Nenana field, appropriating \$100,000 for the making of the necessary surveys preliminary to the leasing of the lands. This appropriation was not carried in the House bill, but upon investigation it was deemed necessary to be made.

Section 2 authorizes the President of the United States to make reservations for the use of the Federal Government not exceeding 5,120 acres in the Bering River field and not to exceed 7,680 acres in the Matanuska field, and limiting the reservations to be made by the Government in other fields in Alaska to an area not exceeding one-half of the coal fields. The proviso to the section authorizes the President, in the case of an emergency, or when he deems it necessary, to mine coal for the benefit of the Army and Navy or the operation of the Government railroads. It likewise gives him that authority if monopoly and oppressive conditions prevail there.

Section 3 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to divide the coal-bearing areas into leasing blocks of 40 acres or multiples thereof, and to offer them for lease by competitive bidding or such other method as the Secretary of the Interior may provide. The second proviso of the section provides that no railroads shall be permitted to own or hold a lease other than for its own exclusive use. The third proviso of the section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make arrangements whereby the Alaskan coal claimants may relinquish any and all rights they may have to a patent under old law, and if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, the circumstances connected with such relinquishment justify so doing, the moneys paid by the claimants shall be refunded by the Government to the claimants. This is left wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and it is thought no harm can come from it and great good may be derived therefrom in cases where it may be the means of clearing up a lot of troublesome litigation that has heretofore found no adequate solution. The last proviso also directs that all claims now pending before the General Land Office and the Department of the Interior shall be adjudicated within one year from the passage of this act. This is only required when the cases have been fully submitted and are now before the department for adjudication. The Department of the Interior was consulted on this proposition, and your conferees were advised that this would give ample time to accomplish the findings required and it would in no way hazard or interfere with the administration of the coal lands in Alaska.

Section 4 is practically identical with the House provision. Section 5 was a paragraph incorporated by the Senate, which was thought to be in the interest of good administration and was thought would accomplish development of the coal fields in Alaska. Section 17 of the bill as it emerged from conference authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to work out rules and regulations which will make the section workable.

Section 6 provides that each lease shall be for such block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, providing how the lease may be forfeited, except that any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

Section 7 is identical with section 7 of the House bill.

Sections 8 and 8a are antimonopoly provisions which were thought to be in the public interest. They should be considered in connection with section 6 of the House bill, which sought to deal with the same problem.

Section 9 deals with the royalties and fixes the minimum at 2 cents per ton, striking out the maximum of 5 cents per ton which was incorporated in the Senate bill. The annual acreage rental being retained in the bill as it emerged from conference is substantially the same as the House and Senate bills. The latter part of section 9 fixes the term of lease at 50 years, the House section fixing it for an indeterminate period, with power to revise the royalty every 20 years. The 50-year provision is in harmony with the water-power bill and the general leasing bill for the United States, and in any event the Secretary of the Interior has full power to incorporate a provision in the lease providing how the royalty may be readjusted, and section 17 also gives him ample power under rules and regulations to readjust the royalty.

It will be observed that the last paragraph of section 9 of the Senate bill was not carried in the House bill. It is as follows:

"All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and

distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act."

It is thought by your conferees that this provision fully protects the Federal Government from the fact that it specifically recites that the revenues derived from coal leases shall be applied to the reimbursement of the Government on account of the appropriation made for the construction of railroads in Alaska. This provision is thought to be in the public interest and in harmony with the Alaskan railroad bill already passed. It will also be noted that after the railway appropriation is disposed of or offset by accruing royalties the residue, if any there be, shall be used according to the act of Congress approved January 27, 1905, providing how the receipts from Alaskan revenues shall be expended.

Section 10 of the bill as it emerged from conference corresponds with section 8 of the House bill, with a slight omission. The exact words omitted are:

"Provided, That not more than one such limited license or permit shall be issued to any single applicant hereunder."

It is thought this provision is a repetition, and therefore unnecessary. It is also capable of being fully taken care of under general regulations.

Section 11 corresponds with section 9 of the House bill and does not depart therefrom in any substantial particular.

Section 12 is identical with section 10 of the House bill.

Section 13 of the bill emerging from conference is a salutary provision which found a place both in the House and Senate bills.

Section 14 is identical with section 11 of the House bill.

Section 15 is identical with the House provision of section 15 of the House bill down to the second proviso. The second proviso of section 15 as the bill emerged from conference was incorporated in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill, which was stricken out. Your conferees feel sure the substitution is in the public interests and one that will meet with approval of both bodies.

Section 16 of the bill emerging from conference is identical with section 12 of the House bill and identical with section 16 of the Senate bill.

Section 17 is identical with sections 17 of the House and Senate bills, respectively.

Section 18 of the bill emerging from conference merely repeals all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith. It is the thought of your conferees that this should be done.

It is the thought of your conferees, first, that the bill as it emerged from conference retains the substantial features of the House bill; second, that it is workable, and that the Secretary of the Interior can proceed to lease the lands that have heretofore been tied up for eight long years; third, that the competitive plan adopted has been retained in the bill and will enable the Secretary of the Interior to derive revenues that may be applied on the Alaskan railway appropriation; fourth, that the bill is one in the public interest, and does not forfeit or sacrifice any rights of the Federal Government to the Alaskan coal claimants; fifth, that the legislation does not do violence or injustice to the Alaskan coal claimants, but leaves them in statu quo; sixth, that the Secretary of the Interior is given ample authority to make large reserves for the benefit of the Government so that the Army and Navy may have an indeterminate fuel supply; seventh, that the appropriation carried by the bill for surveys is necessary in order that the leasing may go on and the emergency that exists in Alaska be relieved; eighth, that the legislation as it emerges from conference has left full discretion in the Secretary of the Interior to protect the public interests and at the same time leave the measure workable so the opening of Alaska may be possible and good results flow therefrom.

Respectfully submitted.

SCOTT FERRIS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is the part in the first conference report which was left out of the second conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. There was one amendment that was put in in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill. Section 15 of the Senate

bill in a word authorized the claimants to sue the Federal Government for any injury they might have or might think they had.

Mr. MANN. Where is that in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. In our first conference report in lieu of section 15 we added a proviso to section 14 of the conference report bill, which was intended to serve in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill. The conference agreed on that and made reports to the two Houses. The Senate objected to it because they thought it sacrificed some Government rights and interests, and after quite a prolonged debate of two days voted it down and sent it back to the conference committee.

Mr. MANN. They sustained the point of order.

Mr. FERRIS. They sustained the point of order; but in effect it amounted to rejecting the whole report. In the second conference report we omitted section 15 of the Senate bill and the proviso we added to section 14.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman read the portion of section 14 in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. I will. It reads as follows:

Provided, That the possession of any lessee of any lands covered by his lease and the operation of the mines and other works thereon or the title of the products thereof shall not be interfered with by the Secretary of the Interior except after an appropriate proceeding in the district court of Alaska instituted for the purpose of securing a forfeiture or termination of such lease, and such forfeiture or termination shall take effect only from the date of entry of final judgment declaring such forfeiture or termination: *Provided further*, That such court proceedings must be instituted within 90 days after notice to the lessee of the facts constituting such cause of action, or the same shall be forever barred.

That was the language that the controversy came up over.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, and I ask for information, that provision would have foreclosed the right of the Government to end the lease by forfeiture for failure to carry out provisions of the lease, unless certain proceedings were instituted in the Federal court within a certain time?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; it was a limitation on the Government.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the change is perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who was on the first conference committee.

Mr. FERRIS. I think I know the views of the gentleman from Wisconsin very well on the first conference, and I think this would be satisfactory to him, if he were here, although the last is merely a supposition.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has had no communication with the gentleman from Wisconsin as to the elimination?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I have not. I had a telegram from him on the first conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate whether there are any other changes in the second conference report from that first agreed upon?

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in reading the last conference report a material amendment, providing for the disposition of the funds arising from the rental and the royalty of coal lands.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; that is a material amendment, and that was inserted in the last conference report. Does the gentleman want me to present the facts in regard to it? There are some other changes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is an important one, and the gentleman may present it in his own order.

Mr. FERRIS. The first conference report did not contain the provision which I will read, but the last conference report does embody it. This language is inserted in the last conference report, but was omitted from the former report. It is found in section 9 of the Senate bill, beginning with the word "all":

All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

That language passed the Senate, and the first conference committee were of the opinion that section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill did all that was necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill, it provided that the funds should revert to the miscellaneous fund of the Treasury.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. I have section 3 of the Alaskan bill, and it might be well to put it into the Record.

Mr. STAFFORD. The House did not specifically oppose the disposition of these funds?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. We leave section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill to govern. That was the action of the House, and that was the action of the first conference report; but the action of the Senate, of course, put in this other provision, and I think the gentleman will remember that the House debated somewhat whether they would put in that provision, but finally decided to stand on the proposition of section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill. It is only a few lines, and I will read it:

SEC. 3. That all moneys derived from the lease, sale, or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites, in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained, or the timber thereon, and the earnings of said railroad or railroads, together with the earnings of the telegraph and telephone lines constructed under this act, above maintenance charges and operating expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscellaneous receipts are paid, and a separate account thereof shall be kept and annually reported to Congress.

That is the language of the Alaskan railroad bill, and, as I say, the House had intended to let that govern. However, there was some very strong insistence in the Senate that we first take the receipts from the coal and from the other revenues up there and pay for the Alaska railroad. Those Senators wanted to preserve the principle of not having the Federal Government go in and take all of the money out of the Territory after that, and after this is paid then step in and let what is known as the Alaska railway fund law apply and the receipts be disposed of in that manner then.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the Senate provision to which the House conferees agreed the second time virtually negative and nullify the provision adopted by the House in the Alaska railroad bill?

Mr. FERRIS. I really do not think it has any effect on it, only so far as coal leases are concerned. Section 3 of the Alaska railway bill applies to timber, oil, coal, mineral, and every available thing, and I think the only thing to modify it would be royalties from these leases, and our conference report does specifically say that these moneys shall all go into the Treasury until the railway appropriation is provided.

Mr. STAFFORD. And after that has been provided, then it shall go—

Mr. FERRIS. As per the Alaskan fund law.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not go into the Treasury?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; it does not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this new provision, money coming in from the rentals and royalties first go to reimburse the Government for expenditures on the Alaskan railroad, and I apprehend, as a matter of fact, that it will be several days, at least, before those funds are entirely reimbursed.

Mr. FERRIS. That is what we feared most.

Mr. MANN. But after that this establishes a principle which never has yet been adopted by Congress, that all of the money then coming in shall be expended in the Treasury for the benefit of the Territory, although in our recent bill I believe that we provided that only one-half should eventually go to the State.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman hardly intends to say that Congress has never done this specific thing, because, as a matter of fact, we only adverted to a law, a thing that Congress did do.

Mr. MANN. I know; but we never have yet disposed of these things in this way. This is an entirely new proposition.

Mr. FERRIS. But we did authorize the sale of Alaskan coal lands at \$10 an acre, and we did provide that those funds should go as the Alaskan fund provides, which, of course, is lots worse than this.

Mr. MANN. That is true enough. A certain amount of money has to be expended in Alaska, and probably this will never be excessive; but when we passed the general leasing bill we provided, first, that the funds should go into the reclamation fund, and then, when repaid by the reclamation fund, one-half, as I recall, should go to the State in lieu of taxation.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. MANN. This provides that in the end all of the money shall go for the benefit of the Territory. I believe the law provides how it shall be expended—schools, charity, roads, and so forth. Probably there will be time enough to change it before they reimburse the Government entirely for its expenditure on the Alaska railroad, but I doubt whether it is a good principle to adopt.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that he and I are not very far apart in our views in respect to that; but I will further say that they are mistaken who think that the pathway of the House conferees was strewn with roses. We could not have our way about all things.

Mr. MANN. That is true; and I have no desire to criticize the conferees; yet the first conference report was agreed to by the Senate conferees. It was not rejected by the Senate, except on a point of order relating to one item, and that item had been left out.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I should have supposed that, leaving that item out for the benefit of the Senate, they would have still agreed to the other things they had formerly agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman's thoughts are traveling along the precise line they ought to travel; and I do not wonder that the gentleman says that we ought to have insisted upon that; but some of the strongest friends the bill had in the Senate said that we must preserve that principle or the bill would not go through. I think we have accomplished so much in other respects that we should be satisfied.

It will probably be 25 or 30 years, and maybe longer than that—maybe after we are all gone—before this Alaska railroad is paid for; and if we are right in that supposition, as the gentleman said, we will have plenty of time in which to correct an error, if it is an error, in that respect.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, it is not material, probably, so far as Alaska is concerned; but it is very material, in my opinion, so far as the continental part of the United States is concerned, where we have the States. We passed a House bill in reference to the general leasing of coal and oil lands, and so forth, and there we determined that in the end one-half should go to the States in lieu of taxation. This principle now adopted here is that all of the money shall go to the States, if the States are put on even terms with the Territory; and, of course, if that coal bill passes the Senate, the western Senators will again insist that all of the money shall go to the Western States where the lands are located. I think these resources belong to the General Government, and when we pay to the State a reasonable amount in lieu of taxes we have done all they ought to ask us to do.

Mr. FERRIS. In reply to that, I will say I agree with the gentleman. I agree with his course of reasoning, I agree with his line of thought, and I agree with his suggestion. I think he has hit the nail right on the head; but, at the same time, it seems to me we ought to pass this law. Congress has heretofore said that the fund should be used in a certain way in Alaska. Now we step in and interrupt that proceeding that Congress had committed itself to by the act of June 27, 1905, long before I ever came to Congress.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion, and it struck me that the youngest man on the floor of this House, perhaps a man not yet born, who may come here as a Member of Congress, will never see a surplus arising in the direction which we are now discussing. The building of the proposed railroad in Alaska, in my judgment, will require all the funds available for the next half century.

Mr. FERRIS. That I fear; but we all hope for a more rosy view.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly indicate if there are any other changes which the conferees agreed to which were not contained in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. As the House is aware, it will be remembered that the first conference report was rejected by the Senate on the theory that we had exceeded our authority, and therefore with some precision we went through the bill in order to avoid anything subject to a point of order. So in section 14 of the conference report on the bill, section 14 of the Senate bill, which corresponds to section 11 of the House bill, we left out this language:

And the lease may provide the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

So in this conference report that language is stricken out. Now, again we made one other change. There was an arbitration provision which passed both the House and the Senate, and our conference committee in the first instance inadvertently left it out. We reincorporated that the last time.

Mr. MANN. What section?

Mr. FERRIS. I will get it in just a moment. Section 11 of the House bill provided this language, among other things:

And the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

The Senate bill provided:

And the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

And we incorporated in the pending conference report that same thought carried—

Mr. MANN. What section of the conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. That was in section 11 of the House bill, corresponding to section 14 of the Senate bill, which now is incorporated in section 14 of the conferees' report on the bill. Then we put in section 12 in the last conference report the words "or sublet," which we had omitted from our first conference report and the Senate had omitted.

Mr. MANN. I do not find that provision of section 14 of the conference report. Can the gentleman state what section it is in?

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 14.

Mr. FERRIS. We add that language to section 14.

Mr. MANN. I do not read it in section 14.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is just before the proviso. The clause before the proviso, section 14, is what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. FERRIS. That is it.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing in that about arbitration.

Mr. FERRIS. "And the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof." It does not say on the face of it it means arbitration, but the conferees took the Senate provision whereby we put it within the power of the Secretary of the Interior to incorporate a provision of that kind. That is our thought. Now, unless somebody desires some time on either side—

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. I desire to ask the gentleman with reference to the last section, 18. What is the thought of the committee with reference to that section?

Mr. FERRIS. Section 18?

Mr. RAKER. The repealing clause in the bill. It reads:

That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. FERRIS. This is the thought: Section 18 of the Senate bill as it passed the Senate, as the gentleman knows, is to repeal the provision with reference to irrigation, and it was the thought of the conferees that we ought not to deal with that matter on this bill, however advisable it may be. I personally would be in favor of repealing it, which could be done at any time, but we did not think we ought to put in a provision providing for the repeal of acts of Congress.

Upon the examination of the Alaskan coal lands that have been made applicable to that Territory it developed that they did not have any appraisalment law at all, and the only thing that could be done up there, if this bill served as a restoration of all these lands, was to sell them at a flat \$10-an-acre rate.

Mr. RAKER. This repealing division then applies solely to the laws as applying to Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. And only so far as they are in conflict with this.

Mr. RAKER. Only so far as they are in conflict with this present bill?

Mr. FERRIS. That is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House would be interested in having the gentleman point out with some emphasis that the conferees did not agree to the absolute royalty basis that was inserted in the Senate for the mining of the coal, but the House conferees retained the original House provision of making it not less than 2 cents a ton.

Mr. FERRIS. I should be very glad to devote a moment to that. As the House well remembers, we had before us and considered very carefully the advisability of trying to place any maximum on the amount to be charged for coal, and the House, I think, was almost a unit on the proposition that we should not. So the House bill provided for the competitive plan of disposing of the coal, with a minimum provision of 2 cents, but no maximum, to the end that the Secretary of the Interior could use his best energies to get all he could for the coal. As the bill passed the Senate they incorporated a provision in it like this, that the minimum royalty shall be 2 cents a ton and the maximum royalty shall be 5 cents a ton. It was the very earnest thought of the House conferees that no such provision as that ought to be incorporated in the law. For instance, what shape would Congress be in, and how could Congress defend, and how could Congress reply, with even good faith, when one coal company offered 10 cents a ton and another offered 12 cents a ton, and another offered 15 cents a ton, when there was a positive prohibition in the law that the Secretary of the Interior could only charge 5 cents a ton royalty? And so the conferees were very steadfast in their opinion on that, and the Senate yielded, and that went out of the bill. So it was neither in this conference report nor in the last, and I feel sure it should not be in either one of them.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like about 10 minutes.
Mr. FERRIS. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there are two features of this Alaskan bill that I desire to discuss briefly. One of them relates to the very important and, it seems to me, significant fact that the Alaska coal bill as it will become a law does not contain any provisions whatever for the protection of the consumer or the user of Alaskan coal, unless such protection may be secured by and through contracts or by and through stipulations in the contract entered into by the Secretary of the Interior and the lessee. It is true there are very indefinite and not very effective provisions in the bill that it might be said were intended to give some protection to the consumer of these coals. We began the discussion of this question of retaining the Alaskan coal lands in public ownership rather than passing title, on the theory that a transfer into private ownership would lead to monopoly, and that it might not be possible under such a system to fully protect the purchaser of that coal from unfair prices; from absolute refusal to sell the product to certain parties; from all of those unfair practices from which people have so frequently suffered in this country. It was said, I think, at the time the matter was under discussion in the House, and when I offered several amendments intended to regulate and control the disposition of these products, that it would all be taken care of under general laws, and there was a section 3 in the so-called antitrust bill as it passed the House, which would have punished an attempt to monopolize or unfair practices in the sale of these products, but, lo and behold, when the conferees took possession of that bill and gave it an anesthetic, and then performed a dental operation, and removed all of its teeth, section 3 evaporated into thin air, went out, and became as though it never had been.

So here we are at the end of all this talk with regard to the Alaskan coal situation just exactly where we were before, so far as any protection to the general public that may desire to purchase and use these coals is concerned. No better off in that respect than we would have been under private ownership. This is a beautiful sample of a legislative "ring around the rosy"—talk, talk, talk, discussion, loud insistence upon the protection of the public. After we get all through with it the public is just where it was before, and absolutely without any additional protection whatever. Even the protection of a general statute, which we would have had, had section 3 remained in the antitrust bill, is denied us, and these lessees can monopolize as much as an owner could have monopolized, can proceed to unfair practices just as much as an individual owner could, unless by some process not clearly understood by me the Secretary of the Interior may be able, in the form of a contract, to restrain that sort of thing. I doubt if he will ever be able to do it. So much for that.

There is another very significant feature of this Alaskan legislation. Alaska is a Territory. We ought to care for her and care for her people quite as well as we care for the people in the States. We ought to guard their interests quite as much, but no more. What is fair in Alaska touching the public lands and touching the utilization of the products and the revenues from public lands ought to be fair within the confines of the States. In Alaska we give the Territory all of the proceeds of leases, every dollar of them. Some of it is to be spent in the building of railroads in Alaska, and the balance is to be utilized for the building of roads, care of the insane, education, and other purposes, as provided by the legislation creating the Alaskan fund. That is the situation in Alaska. It is a just and proper provision. It is just as it should be.

But what did we do with regard to the States of the Union, the Commonwealths of the Union, in the bill which we passed the other day? First, we repealed the sale laws, and therefore the States will not receive the 5 per cent on sales which they now receive. We repealed the provisions under which oil lands are sold and granted them free, so that the States are deprived of the 5 per cent on sales which they formerly received and the opportunity to tax the lands. Now when lands are sold they go on the tax lists, and the communities tax the lands and the properties for the purpose of building roads, maintaining schools, and paying for all the numberless expenses of a civilized and progressive government. But under the recent leasing legislation the State, while it loses the 5 per cent, while it loses the opportunity to tax these properties, does not receive a single solitary cent in lieu of that which it loses. The entire fund may be taken out of the State, beyond its boundaries hundreds and thousands of miles, and used elsewhere.

Of course there is a provision that ultimately 50 per cent of these funds, when they have been used in a reclamation project somewhere, if those dollars can be tagged so as to be identified and recognized when they return, shall be utilized for the bene-

fit of the communities and the States; but in the meantime, in the 20 or 25 or 30 years that may intervene, what are these communities going to do? Where are they to obtain the funds for the education of their children? From what source are they to secure the money necessary for the building of roads, hundreds of miles of them, that they must build right across these lands that are owned by the Government, and from which they will receive not a sou in the way of income?

No ranker injustice than that was ever proposed or suggested in any legislative body on earth, and I can not understand how gentlemen can bring themselves to agree to deprive the Western States of their largest and most important sources of income, and then turn right around, when it comes to Alaska, and provide that Alaska shall have the benefit of every dollar of the moneys received from the leasing of their lands.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have many dear friends on both sides of the aisle in this body and at both ends of the Capitol who feel a good deal as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] does, and they think that we are going to do them a great violence and a great injustice. The real truth about it is, however, that we do so many good things for the West that I would be almost afraid to call attention to them for fear that by so doing the legislation might be defeated. I am not going to take up the time now to tell all the good things that this bill does for the West, but I will tell a few of them.

For the last eight years every acre of land in Alaska has been withdrawn from entry, and could not be used for any purpose. This bill authorizes the surface of the land to be used and entered for homes, the same as lands in Wyoming and elsewhere in the far West. That is benefit No. 1. No. 2 provides that the railroads shall pay their honest debts, which the Alaskan railroads agreed to pay. That is No. 2; and it provides, after that, that the proceeds may be used according to the law which I presume the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] assisted in passing through this House; a law which was passed and approved on January 27, 1905. It was passed before I came here.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman should understand that I am not criticizing what he has done in the case of Alaska. On the contrary I am approving it. I am only criticizing him and his colleagues because they have not done it with the States.

Mr. FERRIS. I will say to the gentlemen over there and to the gentlemen over here that if I thought this was an injustice to the West I would not be supporting this bill, because my heart and my interest and my affections are with the West. This bill does more for you out there in the West than you realize, and you ought to approve it. It permits the surface of the land to be used and entered as homes, and to be taxed by the local communities, and it does that in the general bill. Those lands are now tied up, and can not be used for any purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him one moment further?

Mr. FERRIS. I regret I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to proceed a moment further. I would like to yield, and I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, but I want to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. Benefit No. 2: This coal is subject to taxation the moment it leaves the mouth of the mine, and your legislature can put an excise tax on the products of the mine and the States will derive that revenue.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FERRIS. Let me go a little further.

Mr. MONDELL. Just for a question.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. Instead of having an outrage committed upon him, the gentleman is having an apron full of apples dumped into his lap. What would the gentleman's solution of this Alaskan problem be? Would the gentleman keep Alaska tied up for eight years more? Would the gentleman say that the coal land there should be sold at \$10 per acre, according to the existing law? Would the gentleman say that Secretary Lane ought to restore those lands to entry and let the scandal and riot and trouble arise in Alaska again? I know he would not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not want to misstate my position, I am sure. I voted for the gentleman's bill. I propose to vote for the conference report.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not at all nettled by the gentleman's remarks. I am really very glad to hear from him. But the gentleman is particularly caustic in his attacks, in his savage attacks, on this legislation. My service and the service of my colleagues on the Committee on the Public Lands has been an unselfish one from A to Z. What does any member of the committee on the Democratic side, and what does any member of the committee on the Republican side, and what does the Progressive member of the committee profit by working a year, almost, in getting through some legislation that will actually open up Alaska?

I call the attention of my Democratic colleagues to the fact that there is no one here who would want this Congress to adjourn, after making a \$35,000,000 appropriation for railroads in Alaska, and still leave the coal lands up there tied up. Is there any gentleman over here on this side or over there on that side who would like to enlist under the banner of the gentleman from Wyoming, whose party's program for Alaska looks to no opening up of that vast region? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Eight long years since the lands were withdrawn have elapsed, and you can not now get enough coal even to put in a stove for fire as the result of the program of the gentleman's party. I freely give the gentleman from Wyoming the credit of bringing into this House a bill four years ago—I think it was four years ago—

Mr. MONDELL. Three years ago—

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and I joined with him in trying to get some relief for Alaska. We followed his plan then. I voted with him in his efforts to give relief to Alaska. The gentleman was then chairman of the committee and I was a private on the committee. I threw no obstacle in his way. I stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder with him and tried to get that bill through. What happened? The House virtually rolled us up in a ball and tossed us unceremoniously out of the window. We did not get enough votes to know that we were even in the running. What happened? Myself and the 20 patriotic members of my committee joined hands and said, "We will try to pass a bill that will walk hand in hand with Judge Houston's bill, the Alaskan railroad appropriation bill." What did we do? We brought it in here. The House considered it. Republicans helped with it. Democrats helped with it. Everybody helped with it except the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. It went to the Senate. Nearly everybody helped with it there. It passed the Senate; it passed the conference. They did not even have a roll call on it when it passed the House. They did not even have a roll call on it when it passed the Senate. Everybody was for it but the gentleman from Wyoming. I do not want to say this, but I can not help but make an observation a little bit personal.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman should not say it, because he knows that that is not an accurate statement of the facts.

Mr. FERRIS. I will pause for the gentleman to tell wherein I falsify.

Mr. MONDELL. In the first place, I announced at the beginning of the debate that I was going to vote for the gentleman's bill, and I did vote for it.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but—

Mr. MONDELL. But that did not prevent my calling attention to its faults, to those things in which it failed to do the things you claimed you wanted to do.

Mr. FERRIS. Just a moment further. Yes; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD makes comment more eloquent than the gentleman from Wyoming can ever make, when it shows that the gentleman threw every possible obstacle he could in the way of the bill. He offered dozens of amendments, some of them consisting of entire bills, some of them consisting of sections of old, discarded, bankrupt bills of his own. He was for it. He was like the man walking one way and looking the other. He was offering obstructive tactics from one end of the bill to the other, and still saying he was for it. Let me make the observation I intended to make a moment ago. It may be a little personal or it may not. I may be in error and I may not; but when I look at the Speaker of this House I call attention to the fact that he used to be a prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I find him helping that committee, pushing and helping to make that committee successful.

I look on the Republican side and I find the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who used to be chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I find him helping and aiding that committee, trying to make it successful. I find the Speaker trying to make the committee to which he formerly belonged successful. I find the gentleman from Illinois trying to make the committee to which he formerly belonged successful. I find him offering every aid to Judge ADAMSON in his committee; and fond as I may be of my friend from Wyoming, and

much as I cherish his opinion, I find him rather lagging in his tent, rather pulling back on his halter, instead of rising to the statesmanship and patriotism that the Speaker does and that the gentleman from Illinois does. I find the gentleman from Wyoming retarding the bill, pulling back instead of pressing forward, and throwing obstacles in our way. I did not intend to say this. I want to say to the gentleman now that any way I can render a little aid, any way I can render a little service toward the development of the West, where every cent and every interest I have on earth is located, I shall do it; and if the fortunes of politics should sweep us from our feet and again sweep the gentleman into power, I will be at his back trying to help him accomplish good things for the West. The gentleman does not know how it sounds when he comes in here and utters word, fantastic statements that do not even hold together. They are not what he intends to say.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to give me five minutes. He has seen fit to attack me. I think I am entitled to a little time.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield the gentleman five minutes. I hope he will not take much more time, because I do not want to get into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. It is no argument; it is no answer; it never was since time began and it never will be until all things end, to reply to an argument with personal criticism. The gentleman has not referred to or answered the just and proper criticisms I have made of the bill. Now, I like the gentleman from Oklahoma. He and I have worked together here for years, and generally in harmony. He was against the Alaskan railroad bill and so was I, but he criticizes me because I opposed some features of this bill. Is he not subject to the same criticism for opposing as vigorously as he did the bill brought in by his party for the building of an Alaskan railroad? It is no answer to my criticism to say that I have been vigorously and continuously opposed to certain features of the bill. I have not been an obstructionist on this bill. I offered amendments that, in my opinion, would have helped the bill, some of which were adopted. I offered amendments that were intended to protect the purchasers of these products; they were rejected. There is not a line or a syllable in the bill that affords such protection. It does not answer my argument to say that I have been opposed to some of the provisions of the bill. I shall vote for the conference report as I voted for the bill, but I vote for it fully realizing its faults and determined to point them out. I fully realize what the bill lacks, but I am anxious to do something to help open the coal of Alaska to use. I am always glad to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma, and in the main he and I have been in agreement; but he must not criticize me because I object to things that in my opinion, whatever may be his opinion, are subject to criticism.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] have three minutes—not on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can yield time.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from New York does not want to speak on the bill.

Mr. GOULDEN. It affects the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have three minutes—not on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps what I have here may throw oil on the troubled waters between the two distinguished gentlemen from the West, both of whom are my personal friends. Therefore I ask the indulgence of the House to read it. It is entitled "Out Where the West Begins." It has been my privilege to have traveled over this country extensively, and having a great many friends in the West, of whom I am very fond, and as the subject before the House deals with that section, I think it deserves a place in the records of Congress about this time. The poem, the author being unknown to me, is entitled:

OUT WHERE THE WEST BEGINS.

Out where the hand clasps a little stronger,
Out where the smile dwells a little longer—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the sun's a little brighter,
Where the snow that falls is a trifle whiter,
Where the bonds of home are a wee bit tighter—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the skies are a trifle bluer,
Out where friendship's a little truer,
Out where everything is newer—
That's where the West begins.

Out where a fresher breeze is blowing,
Where there's laughter in every streamlet flowing,
Where there's more of reaping and less of sowing—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the West is in the making,
Where fewer hearts with despair are aching,
Where there's more of giving and less of taking—
That's where the West begins.

Where there's more of singing and less of sighing,
Where there's more of giving and less of buying,
And a man makes friends without half trying—
That's where the West begins.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER SATURDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a number of Members desire to leave the city on Saturday, some of whom have to return to their homes to register. The program of the House is about completed, except when the revenue bill comes back. I have no desire to keep Members here, and I know that it is necessary for them to be in their districts at this time. All I have to ask is that when the revenue bill does come back Members will furnish a quorum to expedite that measure, and I would like to first ask that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Monday is unanimous-consent day, and I think it is advisable that we do not adjourn over that day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 601.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 649.

Resolved, That House resolution 601 directing the Sergeant at Arms to enforce section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offered that resolution as the proponent of the original resolution. It was necessary when the original resolution was passed to maintain a quorum in the House. At the present time business is not pressing, and I believe the membership of the House are willing to respond when the revenue bill comes back. In the meantime there may be some days in which the Members can go to their districts, and I do not think they ought to be penalized when they return to their constituency with an election just coming on.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the adoption of this resolution contemplates the repeal of that statute?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it does not; it could not.

Mr. HENRY. I would like to see the statute repealed, and if there is any way to get up a bill to repeal it I would like to see it done. I do not want to embarrass the resolution presented by the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to have such a bill considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield.

Mr. MANN. I think possibly if the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rules, would report a rule for immediate consideration of such a repealing bill that the rule would pass.

Mr. HENRY. Personally, committing myself to the proposition now, I would like to see the statute repealed to-day. I am ready to do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say this: So far as the statute is concerned, I think this House should have control of its Members, but I do not believe that there ought to be a final repeal of the statute entirely. I think the statute works too great a hardship. I think it ought to be amended so as to only invoke the penalty against a Member when he is absent without leave of the House. That would give the House the right to grant leave to any Member that had a good excuse and yet exercise the power of the House to bring the man back.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to embarrass the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to say that it may be necessary next week to have a quorum on some other matters beside the war-revenue measure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that so far as I am concerned when there is business before the House I shall exercise all the power I have to furnish a quorum, but I do not want to embarrass Members at this time.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to sit here silent and let Members think that there may not be any necessity for a quorum early next week.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us any idea about when the revenue bill may come to the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not; it depends on the debate in the Senate. I do not think it will get back to the House before the middle of next week.

Mr. RAKER. Take my case. It takes me five or six days to get home. Suppose I start home, and next week you are without a quorum and an order for arrest is issued, would I be arrested and brought back?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman would be if the Sergeant at Arms could catch him; but if the gentleman was a day ahead he could not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from California that I do not see that the order would very much relieve his situation, being so far away from home; but it will relieve a number of gentlemen who are only 24 or 36 hours away.

Mr. RAKER. I want to put my case plainly. I am going to have it fixed now, because it is very important to me. The rule, I suppose, should be applied to all, and it would be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to serve his warrant of arrest, and it would be my duty to come back from California in order to preserve a quorum?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I realize that, in justice to this House, many Members probably ought to go to their districts before the election. I have recently told Members on this side of the House that I thought they were at liberty to go home, with the understanding that if necessary to make a quorum those who were near enough should come back when this side of the House asked them to. As far as I am concerned, under the circumstances, while I may not be in favor of the proposition before the House, I would do everything I could to have Republicans enough present to make their share of a quorum so that the House might transact its business.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman if he thinks it will be possible to secure a quorum within 24 hours after it may be necessary to have one here?

Mr. MANN. I can not say whether it would be 24 hours or 48 hours, but I think it is quite possible to secure a quorum within a very short time.

Mr. HENRY. I want to be fair about it. The gentleman understands that I am in hopes that we can have legislation on the cotton situation.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman. I hope we will have legislation to relieve the cotton situation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the Members from the far West, who have been here all of the time, who did not even go home during the interim between the conclusion of the regular session and the beginning of the extra session—that is, between the 4th of March and the 7th of April—about 20 of us, who have helped make a quorum here for a year and a half, could not be excused now and be permitted to go home and not required to come back to make a quorum during the rest of the session?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would take my advice on the subject, I would advise him to go home and not to pay any attention to any request the Sergeant at Arms might make to him. The Sergeant at Arms may not be permitted to make a discrimination, but the gentleman from the far West will not be needed to come back to make a quorum before the election, because we can get a quorum otherwise.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama when he thinks Congress may finally adjourn?

Mr. MANN. When will the European war end? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As far as I can tell, I do not think the revenue bill will be back to the House before the middle of next week. If it comes back by Wednesday, I do not believe it will be possible to adjourn before Saturday week.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman really thinks it may be Saturday week before we adjourn?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it can be before then.

Mr. HENRY. If he does, then I have nothing further to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think we can adjourn before that time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it the general consent of the House after this is through that I may be excused from attendance on the House during the rest of the session?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. That might be the gentleman's view, but I know he does not mean it. My Republican friend can not get rid of me that easy.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think we ought to have the presence of the gentleman from California as much as possible during his limited stay here.

Mr. RAKER. I want to say that I have been attending to my duty for months, when the gentleman who made the remark about my being excused has been away for months.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California has been here so long that it is getting on his nerves.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman from Alabama have any doubts about the ability of the House to get a quorum here without a great deal of trouble in the event this resolution is repealed at this time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubts about it. If I thought there were any doubts about the Members coming back to furnish a quorum to pass the revenue bill I would not ask for this repeal, and I will say farther to the gentleman that if they do not come back I shall offer another resolution proposing the same thing as I did before, but I think they will come back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Will this repeal have any effect on reimbursing those Members whose salaries have been docked under the power of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. CRISP. Personally I would like to see them reimbursed. It does not affect me.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the repealing of this resolution have a retroactive effect so as to save former absentees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose it would for this month.

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the gentleman think that this is an unheard of and preposterous statute, which can be suspended at will, put up or down, according to the will of the majority?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BRYAN. It is a preposterous proceeding that a statute may be a law when we want it and not a law when we do not want it. It seems to me a serious thing to suspend the enforcement of a law, if it is in truth a law.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARTON. Before the resolution is passed I want to know if the passage of it relieves the Sergeant at Arms from making a deduction that the former resolution called for?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would so far as this month is concerned.

Mr. MANN. It leaves it to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and I have no doubt that he will use wise discretion.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman stated that he thought the law ought to be amended so that leave of the House would be a valid excuse.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. A great many Members were absent under leave of the House when the resolution was passed on August 25, and they immediately returned, but pending the time for them to reach here by the usual and most rapid method of travel they were absent a day or two.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not think now is a very auspicious time to hold a post mortem.

Mr. PADGETT. Would the gentleman object to an amendment to his resolution to provide that it should be operative from August 25 last?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I do not think that would do now.

Mr. MANN. That would not have any effect. I would further suggest to the Members of the House that the repeal of this resolution will not deprive any Member of the House of the right to make a certificate to the Sergeant at Arms that he was absent, in accordance with the provision of that section of the law, and is not entitled to his pay for the time that he has been absent. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division. I will not vote to suspend the enforcement of a law. We put it on with a roll call; now let us put it off with a roll call.

Mr. BUTLER. Do not let us do anything of the kind; let us all get away from here.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division, and I am going to vote no.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 81, noes 8.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERRIS. If this House passes a resolution at this time to the effect that the sense of this House was that the Sergeant at Arms should reimburse the salaries to the Members who have lost them, would he be compelled to do it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would take a joint resolution to do it.

Mr. FERRIS. It ought to be done.

The SPEAKER. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. [Cries of "Regular order!"] Under the rule, this being Calendar Wednesday, the House resolves itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that my request that when we adjourn on Friday we adjourn to meet on Monday is agreed to?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the conclusion of the speeches of Mr. MANN and Mr. UNDERWOOD, I be given 30 minutes to make an address to the House on rural credits, especially to discuss two bills, one framed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the report made by the United States commission, confining my remarks to those two bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the hour granted to the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois each has been concluded, he shall be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of rural credits, the speech to be confined to that subject. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman's request merely to make an address?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from further attendance on the House for the next three weeks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he be excused from attendance on the House for three weeks. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 15902, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15902, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 69. PAR. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of the proceedings of Congress shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and promptly at the close thereof, and for a table of contents in each issue of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana will remember I took up some time ago with the Joint Committee on Printing the question of whether it would be possible to have

the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD kept up to date so that you could find something, that index being now semimonthly, and that is what is appropriated for here.

Mr. BARNHART. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. I think we print the index now every two weeks, but this says semimonthly. But is it not every two weeks?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; every two weeks.

Mr. MANN. We print the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every two weeks with a table of contents, and if you want to know whether a thing passed last summer, April, May, or June, you can not find it without looking through all the indexes for that period unless you are lucky enough to strike it the first time. But if you want to know whether a certain thing has been done during this session of Congress, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index furnishes very little information unless you sift through all the indexes. We have now had a session of Congress running nine months. When I took up this matter with the Joint Committee on Printing some time ago I asked what figures they could give, and they gave very large figures for keeping the index current like it is when the final index is finished. I do not know if there is any way of doing that without great expense, but to gentlemen who have occasion now to look up legislation that has taken place at this session of Congress the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index is of very little value unless you know about the date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is the index as prepared now paid for on the item basis?

Mr. MANN. I do not know how it is paid for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. My impression is it must be.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. BARNHART. It is paid for on the page basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a long session like this that is equivalent to a good bonus during this Congress.

Mr. MANN. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If in the last Congress payment to the indexer was a very considerable sum, this session it will be far in excess over the other—a very handsome profit, indeed, and a sum of money probably to justify an index in daily form.

Mr. MANN. I think the expense referred to by the Committee on Printing when I took the matter up was not the expense of making the index, but the expense of printing and paper. I am sorry I have not the letter here.

Mr. BARNHART. I have the letter. Would the gentleman like to have it read?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. It says:

The cost of printing 30,000 copies of the Index and the History of Bills and Resolutions in the present form, as it is now printed, is \$29,348.20.

The cost of printing 30,000 copies of accumulative Index and History of Bills and Resolutions, complete every two weeks, would be \$181,123.40.

The cost of printing the same number of copies of accumulative Index without the History of Bills and Resolutions every two weeks would be \$120,930.60.

The cost of printing 575 copies of a cumulative Index and History of Bills and Resolutions every two weeks for congressional use and 29,425 copies of Index and History of bills and Resolutions in the present form for subscribers would be \$90,825.79.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does that include the editing?

Mr. BARNHART. No. It would not cost any more for editing. The same editorial force would likely do the work.

Mr. MANN. I think this is largely for paper.

Mr. BARNHART. Paper and resetting type. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the information of the committee is that it would require resetting continually, and the printing, binding, and so forth, additional.

Mr. MANN. I do not know why it would require any large amount of resetting—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Of course it would require a change in the forms, and perhaps that would require more or less resetting to bring it down to date. Of course I do not think it would be worth while to go to the expense of \$100,000 extra to have the index. Probably it would not be necessary if you had an index and sent it out to all the subscribers; but there ought to be some way by which Members of Congress can keep track of what has been done at this session of Congress. You can

go and get the Index for the last session of Congress—and that is complete—and look up the Record, but if you want to find what has been done at this session of Congress you can not do it without a large amount of labor, looking through a whole lot of semiweekly or semimonthly indexes. I do not know as there is any way to do it otherwise. Perhaps I make more use of it than most of the Members, and it would be cheaper to give me an extra clerk—which I am not going to ask for—to have matters looked up. But the present method is a very unsatisfactory one where you have a long session of Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee fully realizes all that the gentleman from Illinois has said.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. BARNHART. We have gone into it from every possible angle, and there seems to be no other way, and so far as the increased cost is concerned, I might say the difficulty about that is that there are so many corrections that it virtually means resetting the entire index every time it is changed, and it must be changed, as a matter of course, in order to keep it up to date. Now, all the committee has is the estimate and the word of the Public Printer and those who have had charge of this work for all of these years. We asked them to give us an intelligent plan by which this might be changed, and they said there was no plan except the one suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, and the cost of that was so colossal that the committee decided it would not recommend it.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the committee that the cost that was presented seemed larger than the value of the additional work, unless it could be printed in only a small number; that is, if the principal cost was paper. But possibly that is not the case—it might be resetting—but so that there might be some index by Members of Congress, at least. I thought possibly we could just add a line and insert.

Mr. BARNHART. They say not. They say it means resetting continuously, practically, and that is what makes the cost so high. That and the paper make the cost. The composition is quite expensive.

Mr. MANN. There are several things that the Congress can do which would very greatly expedite the work of Members in looking up things. Of course, you do not have anything to do with the indexing of the proceedings of the House. The index of the House, after the Senate bill as passed the House, does not show in the House index at all. And the man that has to look up something, as many of us have to do constantly, to see whether a bill has passed the House or not, finds it is almost impossible to do it unless you have a clear recollection. My memory is fairly good about legislative proceedings, and yet frequently I have to have somebody spend half a day to find something.

Mr. BARNHART. So far as the personal experience of the chairman of the committee is concerned, he learned after he had been here two or three years and worn his gray matter to a frazzle in trying to find things by the index, that about the shortest cut to it was to go to the document room and get somebody with a good recollection to give him information offhand. It is a complex situation, and it seems there ought to be some way to have it remedied, but how?

Mr. MANN. I frequently go to the document room for information, and about as frequently they come to me for information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I believe that by the introduction of an amendment at the end of line 21, making it read "on a plan to be devised by the Public Printer," an indexing plan can be devised, the cost of which need not exceed the pay of two men at \$3,500 a year.

The index of bills passed can be devised and carried on and the RECORD can be indexed daily. The simply indexing of the daily RECORD can be done every night when the copy for the RECORD is cut out and assigned by indexing the RECORD in four sections—one for the Senate, and one for the House, and one for bills, and one for resolutions. Section 3 will cover bills and section 4 speeches, and a little calendar can be carried on the top, if the Public Printer is so requested, without any additional cost except that of a sheet of white paper—a sufficient index to enable Members of Congress and others to pick out the things in which they are particularly interested.

The matter of indexing has become an expert science. There are several large schools in the United States which teach library and other indexing, and I am satisfied, if the chairman will accept the amendment which I shall offer, giving the Public Printer the authority to devise that plan, that it can be carried out with little additional expense. I offer an amendment at the end of line 21, on page 90, to strike out the—

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, we have passed the section. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that he read down to page 91.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We are providing now for the daily indexing, are we not?

Mr. BARNHART. That is in section 69, paragraph 2, that we are now discussing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will withdraw my amendment, then, for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 69. PAR. 4. No matter that is not germane to the business before either House, except such as shall be spoken in order, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing: *Provided*, That either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length: *Provided further*, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Here is a change in the practice of the House, proposed by this bill, which is revolutionary. There are now on the floor of the House 16 Members of the House; maybe 17. If this paragraph goes into the law and is observed, the four hundred-odd Members who are not present now will have all kinds of cat fits when they learn about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Tell us about it now, so that we can have a little fit right at present. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It will render my friend from Washington more anxious than ever to address the House [laughter], which he always does with grace and value to the House. But there are many Members of the House who insert speeches in the RECORD by permission. This morning by unanimous consent we authorized the insertion of a political speech made by the Speaker a few days ago. It is done every day. But under the provisions of this paragraph no extensions can be made or leaves to insert speeches can be granted unless they are not to exceed four pages in length and are germane to some particular subject when the request is asked for. You could not insert the speech of the Speaker; you could not insert a letter of the President; you could not insert anything unless the Committee on Printing had reported it into the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Is not what is provided here substantially and theoretically, at least, what is the practice in the United States Senate to-day?

Mr. MANN. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Senate of the United States, while it does not follow our practice about extension of remarks theoretically, in fact, it does in many cases, and there is more extraneous matter inserted in the RECORD in the Senate than there is in the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Well, now, just there, is not that usually stated to be, and as a matter of fact is, the production of some one else, and they state that they will insert it?

Mr. MANN. Well, that is very apt to be the case; yes.

Mr. FINLEY. What I had allusion to is this, that unless a matter is actually spoken in the Senate it is presumed not to go into the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I believe that is the presumption, though it is a somewhat violent presumption; but the situation here is entirely different. The House has 435 Members. We bring in a rule here for the consideration of a bill. Under the rules of the House the Member who obtains the floor in general debate is entitled to an hour's time. We know that we can not give 435 hours to the consideration of a bill in the House, and the rule authorizes, and very often by unanimous consent the House authorizes, general leave to print.

Mr. FINLEY. Just there, Mr. Chairman; on page 91, section 69, paragraph 4, it is provided that either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length—not upon the subject of debate, but the subject that he mentions.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but the general debate in the House is not confined in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the bill pending before the House. You do not

seek to change that rule of the House, but a Member who obtains leave to extend his remarks must state the subject and must confine himself to the subject; and under this it is the duty of the Public Printer to read his remarks and see if he does confine himself to the subject, and if not, not print them. Of course the Public Printer will not do that and nobody expects him to do it.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I am constrained to think that the gentleman from Illinois has not examined that as carefully as he might.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will not think that the gentleman from Illinois has not considered that carefully. I examine all these matters carefully, and I have examined this one carefully.

Mr. BARNHART. No doubt, from the statement that the gentleman makes, he feels that he is right, but he does not take into consideration lines 20 and 21 on page 91, and he does not take into consideration the provisions beginning on line 23 of page 91, because that language is as plain as words can make it that—"except such as shall be spoken in order" no matter "shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House."

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; but the gentleman did not read the rest of it. Read the rest of it.

Mr. BARNHART. I read:

After having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. That was what I was talking about.

Mr. BARNHART. It is the matter that is not germane that he is referring to, not the spoken matter.

Mr. MANN. Of course words spoken in the House are not affected by this. The gentleman said I had not read the paragraph. It was the gentleman who had not recently read the paragraph. I said you could not put anything in here, practically, without having the Committee on Printing pass upon it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Under the provisions of that paragraph, could the letters that the President is going to write, commending these various gentlemen for their performance, be put in the RECORD?

Mr. MANN. Not unless they were read in the debate in the House or the Committee on Printing reported favorably on it and the House should pass an order permitting it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINLEY. I will supplement the answer of the gentleman from Illinois by saying it could not be done unless the House granted leave.

Mr. MANN. No; but the House can not grant leave for such a thing without referring it to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the four-page limit is a most commendable and wise provision to be placed in the bill? I have never heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] make a speech of sufficient length to cover more than four pages of the RECORD, and I think most of the men whose speeches are read and have any influence on the country at large never exceed that, because I think no one has the time to read a speech that covers 10 or 15 pages of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I made a speech on the pure-food bill that cost me \$1,000 to print, which was much longer than that, and much of it consisted of extracts which by permission were inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. GOULDEN. I hope the Lord will forgive the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, my understanding is that that could not be done under this bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Those extracts that the gentleman had printed were germane, were they not?

Mr. MANN. I think they were.

Mr. FINLEY. Does not the gentleman think that would come under this provision?

Mr. MANN. Not if they exceed four pages in length.

Mr. FINLEY. My view is that permission for the insertion of matter in the Record will go on much as it has gone on before.

Mr. MANN. I expect so. Why? Because the Public Printer will not undertake to carry out the law, and the result of it will be that Members of the House who are conscientious in their endeavor to obey the law will not print these speeches in the Record, and those who do not care whether they obey the law or not will print them in the Record. That happens now, sometimes.

Mr. FINLEY. That is an abuse which is practiced at times, is it not?

Mr. MANN. It is an abuse that you are going to encourage the practice of.

Mr. FINLEY. The purpose is to stop abuses to some extent.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not even say that I criticized the provision in the bill. I think it would be very unfortunate for the House to pass a proposition of this sort without anybody calling attention to what it means. Here is an entirely revolutionary proceeding in the House. A few moments ago, as I stated, there were 17 Members on the floor of the House. I do not propose to make the point of no quorum, because I do not wish to delay the consideration of the bill, and I do not propose to make a motion to strike this out, although I doubt whether it will ever become a law, and I am sure that if it does it will raise as much trouble as the docking resolution which we repealed this afternoon. It is impossible for all the Members of the House who wish to put their views in the Record to obtain the floor to make their speeches in the House itself, or to obtain permission under the provisions of this bill to insert speeches. Now, I have reached that stage in the proceedings of the House where I make too many speeches, where usually I get the floor without great difficulty, and where I seldom extend remarks. But I tell you that you can not enforce the provisions of this paragraph with the old Members of the House who have acted differently or with the new Members of the House who have no other opportunity to get into the Record. Refer it to the Committee on Printing! Well, I shall be sorry for the chairman of the Committee on Printing if this ever gets to be a law.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Illinois, I am very sorry that there are not more Members here to participate in the consideration of this important question; but, notwithstanding, I would like to call attention to a few features of the abuses under the present privilege of Record printing, that have grown to such proportions that, it seems to me, they ought to be corrected by some form of legislation. I understand that no enactment can be effective that may not inflict some hardship. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after years of deliberation, first by one committee and then another, we have reached the conclusion that there ought to be some method by which the privilege of padding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to such an extent that it is a joke throughout the country ought to be curtailed. I want to call attention to a few specific instances, and I am not going to be partisan about this matter, and I am not going to mention names, because it is just as bad on this side of the House as it is on the other side, and I do not know but in one or two instances the big scandal that might have been precipitated if the newspapers of the country had known it would have fallen upon the Democratic side of the House. With due regard to his vast learning, the committee probably knows as much about this question as the gentleman from Illinois, and that is not any reflection on him. It is no extravagant self-praise of the committee to say it has been over these things studiously, and I want to call attention first to the provisions of the bill as we believe it should be, beginning with line 18, on page 91. I want to get this into the Record:

SEC. 69. PAR. 4. No matter that is not germane to the business before either House, except such as shall be spoken in order, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

That means that Dick, Tom, and Harry will not be permitted hereafter to jump up and offer all sorts of material for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purposes, which has no place therein whatever.

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope I will not be interrupted until I have finished this, and then I will answer any question. This bill provides that—

either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the Record upon a stated subject—

just as we do now; we always require mention of the subject on which he is going to extend his remarks—

but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the Record in length: *Provided further*, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article,

or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that this will effectually safeguard the recklessness with which matters not germane to questions in hand nor to any subject of legitimate consideration by the House are thrown into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I want to give you a few instances. Under leave to extend remarks during the tariff debate not long ago a Member of the House inserted as a part of a general speech six bills not relating to the tariff introduced by himself, filling four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then added another page of his biography from the Congressional Directory.

Under leave to extend remarks during the currency debate a Member put in the Record a description of his European trip as printed in the Washington Post, discussing the cost of the trip, his seasickness, the cathedrals that he saw, and details of the complexity of foreign languages which he encountered.

Mr. BUTLER. Did he publish his photograph with it?

Mr. BARNHART. He probably would have if he could have got it in. The gentleman also published some correspondence with a Senator, and, under leave to extend his remarks, inserted it the next day after Congress adjourned, in which he bitterly assailed the Senator, contrary to all rules of either House.

Another gentleman, a Member of this House, under leave to print in the Record, put in a speech delivered by a former member of the President's Cabinet at a funeral of a celebrated brewer of the United States, thus adding advertising publicity to a certain brand of goods a like product of which made a certain city famous.

This same gentleman, under leave to extend remarks, inserted in the Record the index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress relating to himself, here and there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Another Member of this House, under leave to print, extended his remarks, inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official proceedings of the third biennial meeting of the National Democratic League of Clubs, with an extended list of the contributors and expenditures, filling, in all, 20 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It costs \$31.05 a page, running cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to publish it. So that it cost over \$600 to insert these 20 pages of folderol about a Democratic league of clubs that originated and was kept afloat by a certain gentleman whose name I will not mention, largely for the purpose of providing himself with a job. What has become of the league I do not know, but I know it was an outrage for anyone to insert in the Record that stuff, not because it was any reflection upon the party, but because it had no business in the Record.

Another gentleman inserted in the Record, under leave to extend remarks, the constitution of the Women's National Democratic League. Another, under leave to extend remarks, inserted in the Record 30 pages of the official review of the Chicago convention contest, a memorable occasion, in which our friends the enemy broke up and had more or less of an extensive row. It had no place in the Record any more than the report of the Democratic League of Clubs.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. I will in a moment, after I have finished this. In another instance a Member of Congress, not at this end of the Capitol, inserted an article entitled "The Mission of Woman," and this article was afterwards expunged from the Record by order of the Senate and then reprinted in it after the serious objectionable parts had been taken out. The article was written 40 years ago, and said of the women of the North:

They would fain enter the lists of pothouse politicians and become the rivals of negroes. Let them, O fair daughters of the South, pursue their own course. But if they will unsex their souls, let them at the same time lay aside their modest apparel.

Another abuse not so very long ago was when there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an allegorical cow that to my certain knowledge was 25 years old, because it had been published in a newspaper away back as far as the days of Cohn Harvey. And yet in the recent past a cartoon of that sort, without consent of the Joint Committee on Printing, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If it had been first submitted, under the provisions of this bill, it never would have

been put in the RECORD, and thus caused the merited criticism of newspapers throughout the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That was not chargeable to this body, was it?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it was not; and yet it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The general public does not discriminate as to who authorizes it; they only see the abuse.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The point I am trying to bring out is that all the abuse of this kind is not attributable to this body, where we are given leave to extend remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is it not a fact that these examples the gentleman has given, which I admit are outrageous, are rather the exception than the rule? The gentleman does not mean to have the country believe or infer that Members of Congress at either end of the Capitol are guilty of these extravagant practices of printing matter in the RECORD as a general thing?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; it is not common at all.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is not common, I am certain; but, inasmuch as this has occurred, I can not see any possible objection to forestalling such things in the future by this commendable section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOULDEN. One thing I desire is to have the gentleman bring out the fact that the great majority of the Members are not guilty of practices of that character which the gentleman seeks to stop by the provision in this bill, because the newspapers are very apt to poke a good deal of fun at the Members of Congress, and when they do it justly I accept my share of the criticism; but I do not want to fall under the ban that the provision of this bill seeks, as I think very properly, to remedy.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I think, in reply to that, it is safe to say that the abuse of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not general. On the other hand, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ordinarily costs about \$1,000,000 per Congress, and in these two years just about to pass it will cost pretty nearly twice that amount. The committee has kept not very careful, but general, oversight over what has been inserted, and a very great amount of this increased expense is due to the insertion of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that have nothing whatever to do with the proceedings of Congress. For instance, just within the past few days there have been two requests granted for unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of an ex-President of the United States—a lengthy speech. I hold in my hand here a special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an abuse to which I called attention at the time that it was published. My recollection is that the cost of this one speech—not a speech, but the result of the unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD—was \$13,860.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is, one issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that purpose, covering 363 pages, and costing over \$13,000. This certainly should be corrected.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. It was a special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the express purpose of complying with the request, granted by unanimous consent, of a distinguished gentleman to extend his remarks in the RECORD. If the proposed law had been in effect that sort of voluminous publication would not have been permitted, even if the committee had reported it favorably.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The case to which the gentleman has just referred is another case where the responsibility was not upon the House, is it not?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. That was done under the rules and law governing another body; but this bill is drafted to regulate both branches of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understand that; but we have enough sins of our own to answer for without conveying the impression that we are responsible for somebody else, and I hope the gentleman will make that clear.

Mr. BARNHART. I tried to make that clear, and I think if the gentleman will read my remarks in the opening he will see that this is intended to cover the action of both branches of Congress, and he will see that I read down the list and told

what had occurred in this branch, and then I went on with what had occurred in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I probably did not hear the gentleman when he made that skip.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope I make myself clear now.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I find that this special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which the gentleman from Indiana has just referred consists of 360 pages. It is all one gentleman's speech.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, that is not a speech, but just matter that he had inserted into the RECORD under leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have never read it, and I suppose nobody else ever did.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if the great majority of the abuses of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD do not come under the head of leave to print?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. There were 30,000 copies of this particular special issue printed and distributed, and a large majority of them would go through the mail.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Assuming now that it costs from 6 to 7 cents a pound to go through the mail, there would be all that cost in addition to the Government Printing Office cost, which is between thirteen and fourteen thousand dollars.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; that is true. The cost of printing alone was \$13,860.

Mr. FINLEY. And the postal cost is in addition to that?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to be permitted to conclude this statement. I want to call attention to another matter, and that is this: In the not distant past there has come to the committee a request to publish a political campaign book—and I do not care whether it is the Democratic campaign book or the Republican campaign book or the Progressive campaign book or what not—I doubt the propriety, after we have given everybody leave to extend their remarks and discuss all of the political topics under the sun, of authorizing the publication of a campaign textbook in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be and was originally intended to be a record of the actual proceedings of Congress. These instances that I have cited are few. Many, many more, though probably not so grave, could be found, and yet no doubt reference to the RECORD would show others that exceed these in gravity. The committee has undertaken to formulate a plan to prevent this. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says that the work of the chairman of the committee will be most hazardous and laborious. The committee realizes this, and I believe the gentleman from Illinois will agree to it in a measure that when the membership of the House, that part of it which has been given to extravagant use of the RECORD in printing all sorts of magazine and newspaper articles and speeches, foreign to anything that could possibly pertain to Congress, understands that the particular matter they desire to be printed under extension of remarks must be offered in the House and then referred to the Committee on Printing and reported back to the House and submitted to the House for its approval, they will hesitate a long time before they will offer that sort of junk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. BARNHART. I think I said that I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman did.

Mr. BARNHART. My time has expired, unfortunately.

Mr. MANN. That is all right. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he thought it was any more improper to publish the proceedings of the Republican National Convention in reference to a difficulty there than to publish the platforms of the two parties?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman asks me that question—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not want this to be taken out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARNHART. There is a wide difference between a declaration of national principles and a party row.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired, and the gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the committee, will for

a moment give his attention, I desire to ask him some questions for information, and I take this occasion first to congratulate the gentleman—the chairman of the committee—on the work that that committee has been doing and what it has done already. I agree largely in reference to what has been done to stop the abuses of padding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman whether this bill, if passed in the way in which it is reported here, will cure these abuses? Now, take the one case to which the gentleman alluded a moment ago, where, in the Senate, was inserted a whole volume costing, as the gentleman said, some \$13,000. Was not that inserted by permission specially given by the Senate? Could not that have occurred just the same under this bill if it became a law?

Mr. BARNHART. The two branches of Congress, as I understand, have a perfect right to conduct their affairs and control their own proceedings as they see fit, especially if it is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know; but I wish the gentleman—

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know but under the provision I read in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, when he said there was no way by which it could be done, where it says, "unless especially authorized," if it be specially authorized by either branch of Congress it can be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, take the document that is before the gentleman. It is my understanding that a distinguished Member of another body rose and said that he was going to read all of the stuff that went in there unless he was given permission to print it. Now, could not the same thing happen if this bill became a law? It would not stop that performance, would it?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it could not interfere with that except in so far as it would become a public document under the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Another matter I want to inquire about is this: I understand this limits a speech to four pages. I agree with most of the provisions, but I do not think that ought to be. Now, I will give an illustration. Suppose some Member of this House wants to discuss a question that is of particular importance in his locality. I will give the gentleman a personal illustration, because it has come to my mind, and many others have had the same experience. Say I wanted to discuss the question of Panama tolls. It is absolutely impossible for that question to be thoroughly discussed in four pages. Now, is it the purpose of the committee by this legislation not to permit a Member of Congress to print a speech of more than four pages—

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no—

Mr. BUTLER. You can increase it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want some information.

Mr. BARNHART. Congress would have a right to authorize it. The law says "unless specially authorized," and I have no doubt that if the gentleman should arise in the House on an important question of that kind and say to the House that the remarks and statistics that he had could not be contained in four pages of the RECORD, if he asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the question which he had prepared, there would not be any objection. Members of the House are generally fair.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Can that be done under the bill without referring it to a committee?

Mr. BARNHART. Not unless otherwise authorized. If you get consent of the House it could be done, but it would prevent the superfluities I have enumerated here and it would discourage Members from asking for the insertion of all sorts of speeches and publications for the reason that they would hesitate to refer questionable matter to a committee for approval.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Following the question asked by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], it seems to me that on a proper occasion and upon a proper subject—if the gentleman will answer the question in order that I may see if I am right—after a Member has had his hour in the House in which to make a speech he might have four pages in the RECORD in which to extend his remarks. If he desires more than four pages in which to print what he did not have an opportunity to say here in the House, the opportunity may be given him by the House. This bill will not deprive him of extending his remarks beyond four pages. It simply requires him to appeal to the House for the privilege.

Mr. BARNHART. Not in that instance, because he had the right to make the speech, and he might make it 10 pages long if he got the time, and then if he asked the unanimous consent

of the House to extend his remarks, rather than to take more time he could print his speech in full, no matter how many pages it would require.

Mr. BUTLER. I think this provision is a good one, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. With pleasure.

Mr. FINLEY. I have known of a few instances where a party did not obtain permission of the House to extend remarks—did not obtain recognition—and there was no general leave granted to extend remarks or insert remarks in the RECORD, and yet the speech appeared. I know of an instance several years ago where a lengthy speech occurred and the party did not even get recognition from the Chair. Now, it would be impossible under this provision of the law for that party to perform in that way.

Mr. AINEY. For the purpose of asking a brief question of the chairman of the committee—

Mr. BARNHART. Right there, will the gentleman yield? I want to add a word of explanation to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] has said. As a matter of explanation to the gentleman's position, there are numerous instances wherein Members have risen and asked unanimous consent for leave to extend their remarks, and have then printed two or three speeches in the RECORD under one leave.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate that fact, and I have been thankful many, many times that they have asked permission to print rather than to inflict their speeches upon me as one Member who is required to sit here. [Applause and laughter.] But I think there should be some restraint placed upon the opportunity which gentlemen have had. And for one minute, if the chairman will give me his attention, I wish to state that this is a useful provision, because the time is not far off when the length of hours and the length of days will not be given to this House to properly attend to the business which it is required to attend to. I will ask the gentleman whether or not he has not omitted from this paragraph a word which it should contain. First, if I understand it, it has two propositions in it: First, that no matter that is not germane to the business before either House shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, secondly, that unless it is spoken it shall not be printed. First, it shall be germane, and, secondly, it shall be spoken. If that be so, if I am right in my view of the paragraph and its true purposes, I think you should have the word "and" in between the words "House" and "except."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] may have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I will answer the question by saying it seems to me the insertion of the word "and" in there would couple the two together into one meaning.

Mr. BUTLER. Do you not intend to do it?

Mr. BARNHART. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not the purpose of the act, first, to make the matter which is to go in the RECORD germane, and, secondly, that it shall be spoken? Because you provide for instances in which it need not be spoken and where matter can be printed when it is not germane.

Mr. BARNHART. In general debate the matter is frequently not germane, and yet it is spoken in order.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not propose to be technical about it, but that is the way it impressed me.

Mr. BARNHART. We want to get it right. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. BUTLER. Any matter that is not germane to the business before either House shall not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No matter that is not spoken in order shall be printed. Does the gentleman catch the point I am endeavoring to make? It seems to me by reading it and by looking at the paragraph that the committee intended that first of all the matter spoken in the House should be germane to the business of the House.

Mr. BARNHART. I think if the gentleman will examine it carefully he will find that it would cut out general debate. It might be so construed by the insertion of the word "and" in there.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course I would not want that to occur.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] will yield, I do not think it is possible by law to control what is spoken in the House. If the House permits a man

to make a speech, it is within the control of the House and not in control of a law made by the President, the Senate, and the House combined. Now, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to show what is spoken in the House. That is the purpose of this exception. While it says "in order," that is not the business of this legislation. If it is spoken in the House, it is supposed to go in the RECORD, unless it is stricken out, as it was erroneously the other day.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this paragraph is, first, to limit the matter spoken in debate to germaneness or that which pertains to the business of the House.

Mr. MANN. It is matter, though, which is not spoken in the House that this has reference to. This paragraph has reference to debate that does not take place. It is theoretical and not actual.

Mr. BUTLER. All right. It seems to be all right if we can pin it down.

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso in a formal way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] is recognized.

Mr. AINEY. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether the second and third provisos may not lead to some confusion? By the first proviso leave may be granted to a Member to print and extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject by action of the House. Supposing, now, that the Member should incorporate in that speech, or desire to incorporate in that speech, a newspaper article or a reference to some book or pamphlet, would not there be some confusion because of the terms of the second proviso, which prescribes that such may not be printed without the leave of the House after reference to the committee?

Mr. BARNHART. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the second proviso sets forth that—

No address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. AINEY. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the other proviso also relates to an address not delivered in the House. Suppose a speaker proposed to incorporate in the RECORD a book or a newspaper article in order to illustrate his speech. He has leave to do so under the first proviso by securing leave of the House, but is prohibited from doing so under the second proviso other than as he may obtain from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the second proviso clearly refers to the matter as a whole, whereas if a man wanted to extend his remarks and wanted to use a quotation I do not see that there could be any limitation on that. But he would be prohibited from seeking to extend his remarks in the RECORD and then inserting this publication which is allowed under the first provision.

Mr. AINEY. Under this provision if anyone obtaining permission to extend remarks under the first proviso purposes to quote therein briefly from a newspaper article he can not so quote and print without obtaining a second leave under the second proviso, which requires submission to the Committee on Printing. Is that the purpose of the chairman?

Mr. BARNHART. If I have a short publication, yes; and if not, no. That is my answer. The purpose of this is to prevent a Member from doing what we frequently see done—rising and asking unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a certain article, and then the next day another Member sees an article in refutation of it, and he asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting a certain other article. The purpose of this legislation is to see to it that these matters are referred to the committees of the respective Houses and let them pass upon them. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois if they do not believe that this precautionary feature of the law will prevent so much recklessness in the matter of filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with documents?

Mr. AINEY. I will say to the chairman of the committee that I find myself quite in accord with the purposes of this bill, but I doubt if confusion will not arise by these two provisions, one of them providing for permission to be granted by the House upon request, and the other necessitating the going to the committee with the further request if it is intended to cover a quotation from some book or newspaper which the speaker desires to incorporate in his extended remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. Just one moment. It was the intention of the committee—and I still believe that it is clear—that the second provision is simply a limitation on the first—to prevent

abuse if a Member undertakes to offer an article in order, or, as we see it frequently done and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania sees it done, where a Member will write two three lines and then insert four or five pages of a book or a document.

I will say in this connection that not in this branch of Congress, but in another one, and not very long ago, a publication was given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to child labor that covered pages and pages and pages, and it was printed as a public document afterwards; and it cost the Government, according to the figures I heard last, something like \$45,000. I do not suppose the man who put it in there ever read all of it, and I do not know that he will ever read all of it, and I do not know that an estimate of the printing cost was ever asked for. In that case it could be referred to the Committee on Printing, and they would take it up with the Member; and if they decided to report it favorably they could report it to the House, and the House could do with it what it saw fit. It leaves the matter in the hands of the House and not in the hands of the individual Member. That would prevent the possibility in the future of such abuses as have occurred heretofore. They could not occur under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] if his pro forma amendment is withdrawn?

Mr. AINEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I ask leave to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Then I renew the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois renews the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. I am quite in sympathy, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Indiana and the Committee on Printing in the endeavor to prevent many of the abuses that come from printing in the RECORD. I do not believe there is any Member of the House who stays on the floor of the House more than I do or who keeps closer track of the proceedings in the House than I do. I have seen gentleman after gentleman during my term of service rise and say that he was going to stop all future leaves to extend remarks. I think I heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] come pretty nearly making that statement.

Mr. BARNHART. That I would try to.

Mr. MANN. I know that I heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] make that statement. I remember distinctly hearing the distinguished leader of the Progressive Party [Mr. MURDOCK], who has not been here for a long time, make that statement here in the House. I have seen them come and go, but I never saw one yet to stick out with his resolution; and yet I am not criticizing them for yielding. Why? Everyone knows that if you insist upon nothing being printed in the RECORD except what was spoken in debate, 12 months in the year would not be long enough for windjamming in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUTLER. One hundred months in the year would not be long enough.

Mr. MANN. I sometimes wish myself that there were more extensions and leaves to print and fewer actual speeches; and yet it would not be gracious for me to say that, because I make too many speeches.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that something ought to be done, but I think that something ought to be done that is practical. Who is to determine about these things? Suppose the House grants leave to me to-day to extend my remarks, and this bill is in effect. Who is to determine whether what I insert is germane or not? Who is to determine whether I have put an editorial from some paper in my remarks or not? Who is going to prevent the speech being printed? My distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] both stated a while ago that they knew of cases where men had inserted speeches in the RECORD without any permission at all. How did it happen? How did the gentlemen know it? Why did they not stop it? Why did they not strike it out of the RECORD as a matter of precaution in the future?

Mr. FINLEY. I will answer for myself. I knew nothing about it until it was all in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Then it was not too late to strike it out. I am not criticizing the gentleman for not moving to strike it out. But the same thing will happen again. Who is going to determine? Shall it be the Public Printer? Why, we had an officer of the House here the other day obeying an order of the House; yet he was seriously criticized by several gentlemen on the floor

who thought that the dignity of their position had been invaded. If some gentleman gets leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and the Public Printer tells him to go to, and throws his remarks in the wastebasket, there will be an explosion here like a bomb falling from an aeroplane. Who is to determine? I believe if you do something, you ought to do it so that it will work.

Now, I have heard several gentlemen tell about these leaves that have been granted in the past under which matters have been inserted which ought not to have been inserted in the RECORD. I am looking now at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a few days ago, and I find an article in it, practically the same thing having been published before by Members of Congress, inserted here by a member of the Committee on Printing. I am not criticizing him for inserting it, although much of the same stuff—I will not say “stuff,” much of the same fine matter—has been inserted before, originally. I believe, by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] on labor propositions, and other Members have taken a pair of shears and a bottle of paste and written new speeches and inserted them in the RECORD. I am not criticizing that. What do they do it for? To send it to their constituents, so they can tell what great work has been done or has not been done by the Democratic Congress.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman asks. Who will prevent the abuses in the future? Does not the gentleman think a positive provision of law prohibiting abuses of that character would act as a deterrent?

Mr. MANN. Why, there is a positive provision of law now that forbids a man to insert in the RECORD remarks which he has not permission to insert, and yet gentlemen cite as a reason for this the fact that Members have violated the law in the other respect. Now, a law ought to be so framed that honest men can properly obey it and dishonest men can not easily evade it.

Mr. FINLEY. The purpose here is to make the law more explicit, so that every Member of Congress may know what it is and understand it and obey it. I will say, further, that I think that the disciplining of about one Member under this proposed provision of law would be enough to settle the question for a good while after that.

Mr. MANN. Oh, pshaw! Talk about Members being disciplined! I know several Members of this House who are sending out political letters under their franks in violation of law, as I read the law. You can not discipline them for it. Each man looks at these matters according to his own lights, and if he stays here, according to the lights of his constituents; but you can not provide by a law so that you can have a practice in the House of Representatives unless you have a reasonable law.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I appreciate the fact that it is utterly impossible to enact any legislation anywhere that will be strictly observed by all men; but in the House of Representatives, when we discover abuses that exist whereby there are enormous losses to the Treasury of the United States, it seems to me it is high time for the Congress to get busy on its own account and try, to the largest extent possible, to set its own house in order. Now if we know of these things existing, and we wink at them, of course the criticism of the public is going to increase. In this connection I am going to impose upon the RECORD long enough to read an extract from an editorial in the New York Press of August 26. It says:

A well-edited report of real debate, confined to things actually said, would attract a great deal of interest. Few people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the interminable length of speeches issued on “leave to print.” If Congress won’t listen to these speeches, with all the added interest that comes from the personality of a statesman engaged in public debate, the public are not going to stop to read them.

Thus the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to those who receive it, is a daily reminder of unbusinesslike methods. The Congress that shall have the force to cut out such absurdities will make more friends than it is now able to realize.

Mr. Chairman, that is in conformity with my experience and observation both as a newspaper man and a Member of the House for several years. I think I stated once before on the floor of the House that Members of Congress who send copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to newspaper offices are really considered a joke. Back in the days when we kindled fires in stoves in the early fall—and a good many of them do yet—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it came to the newspaper office was corded up by the devil in the office to be used as fuel. We used it to prop up the windows and to cut into wrappers, but I am safe in saying that not one CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in ten that goes into the average newspaper office of the United States is ever opened to be read, because the daily news service furnishes to these newspaper men a touch of what is being

done in Congress from day to day, and they edit from their wire service or other press reports that come as the summarized proceedings of Congress, and that is all they have time to consider. I merely call attention to this to show that the growing tendency to pad the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with all sorts of extraneous matter is making the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more and more a bore in the estimation of the reading public of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. How would the gentleman answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the person who shall determine whether the matter submitted is germane or not?

Mr. BARNHART. The bill provides a printing clerk, who shall have charge of the editing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The law regulates the Public Printer. I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that we have a Public Printer who has some one at the Government Printing Office who exercises very vigilant scrutiny over what comes down there for printing.

Mr. MOORE. For one I am very glad of that.

Mr. BARNHART. For instance, within the last few days some copy for a book was sent down there by a House committee. The bulk of it was a so-called public document which was not a public document at all, but a personal testimonial, and it was refused by the Public Printer, who referred it back to the Committee on Printing and said that he would not print it under the law authorizing the printing and binding for committees unless it was O. K’d by the Committee on Printing. The Committee on Printing refused to O. K. it and the document will not be printed, because it is not a public document. It would cost something like \$500 to print and bind it for the benefit of a very few. If they want to have it printed and pay for it, that is their privilege, and I hope they will have it done; but the people ought not to be expected to pay for these things, and the renewed regulations and the more stringent rules adopted from time to time by the Joint Committee on Printing and the Printing Committees of the two Houses are eliminating more and more of unwarranted printing; and if you give the committee an authorization of law to take a step further and exercise some control over the superfluous matter that is inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we believe it will have a like helpful effect.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. With what the gentleman from Indiana has said in the matter of striking out superfluous material and matter that is not germane, I heartily agree. I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be heightened in interest and value if it were severely cut. There is too much in it for an ordinary Member of Congress to read, let alone the ordinary citizen. I question whether authority is given to anyone in section 68 or the preceding sections to exercise any control over the matter submitted by Members of Congress which might not be germane. The Committee on Printing is itself given authority in section 68 to oversee addresses “not delivered in the House, books, pamphlets, magazines, articles,” and so forth, and I suppose they would go to the Committee on Printing and the committee would exercise some authority. As to leave-to-print speeches, apparently that would not be submitted to the Committee on Printing, and it is not the duty of anyone to supervise them, except this “competent person” mentioned in section 69, paragraph 3.

Now, it is patent to all who read the RECORD, and I am one who tries to follow it, that matter not germane very frequently creeps in under leave to print. That is an abuse. Another abuse is the insertion in the daily proceedings of the House of matter under leave to print that has no bearing on the proceedings of the House. That would give rise to the criticism of the paper which the gentleman from Indiana quoted a little while ago. But reverting to the interrogatory of the gentleman from Illinois, just how are you going to check that up? I would like to see it done. I would support the gentleman from Indiana and his committee in any movement to edit the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, boil it down, or summarize it. But is anyone given authority to do that here? Would it be possible to create an editorship and have the copy visced, as in a newspaper office; have it blue penciled? I do not know that we want to give anyone authority to blue pencil our copy, but I think some one should have authority, like the Committee on Printing, to see that this extraneous matter that does not appear to be germane shall not be inserted in an improper place, and that personal and political matter shall not appear as a part of the proceedings of Congress. Such matters ought to be scrutinized.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman understands that the Government Printing Office has a corps of copy readers?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; but with no editorial authority.

Mr. BARNHART. No; but when a speech came in under leave to print they would be expected to look it over, and they would look it over, as the other matter was looked over to which I referred; if questionable, referred to the Committee on Printing, and then it would be for the Committee on Printing to decide whether or not it ought to go in. I want to say in this connection that if the Committee on Printing had had charge of the Record in the not very distant past some things would not be in the Record that have appeared, because it was a great abuse.

Mr. MOORE. I recall, and I have no doubt the gentleman recalls, an instance in which not very long ago a speech was inserted under leave to print, which nobody in the House had an opportunity to see or scrutinize, reflecting very severely on certain citizens who had no opportunity to respond. These citizens had no chance to be heard as to the accusations therein made. We might call it a scurrilous speech. The speech went into the private affairs of private citizens, dragged them into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where none of us wanted to see them and where the only purpose attained was scandal. Some one ought to have observed that and called it to the attention of the Committee on Printing. Some one ought to have authority to know that it could not go in until it was O. K'd.

Mr. BARNHART. Nobody under the existing law has any authority to do anything of that kind now.

Mr. MOORE. Who has the authority under this bill to do that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say in reply to the gentleman that it is the bounden duty of the Public Printer to observe the law regulating public printing and binding, and when this law takes effect he will be bound, through his assistants, to see when leave-to-print speeches come to him whether they are in order. If there is a question in his mind, he will do what he does now in the instance I have cited, refer them to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman and his committee are doing a splendid work in codifying the printing laws, and I would like to support him. But let us see if this is the proviso on which the gentleman relies, page 92, line 3:

Provided, further, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Is that the proviso on which the gentleman places his faith?

Mr. BARNHART. That is the proviso, if there is a request to insert a book as a whole, without any reference to remarks.

Mr. MOORE. Wherein is the check to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. BARNHART. Under the general provision governing the Public Printer or superintendent of documents, wherein, if the Public Printer, the superintendent of documents, or any other officer or employee of the Government Printing Office shall permit or knowingly be party to any evasion or violation of this act, whereby the Government shall suffer any loss or damage therefrom, he shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Mr. MOORE. Where is that?

Mr. BARNHART. Beginning on page 76. We have long since passed it. It fixes a fine of \$5,000, and with that penalty over the Printer he will be careful to see that the law regulating the extension of remarks is carefully enforced so far as he is concerned. If there arise a question in his mind as to the admissibility of matter, he will refuse it and refer it to the Committee on Printing of the respective House by which the leave was granted.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is satisfied in his own mind that he has put a proper check in the Government Printing Office where the copy must go?

Mr. BARNHART. It is about as strong, it seems to the committee, as it could possibly be made. We exact from the Public Printer a stricter observation of the law governing him than ever before, because we propose to fine him \$5,000 if he does not observe the law. That is one thing we did not have

before. We expect under the provisions of this bill that the Public Printer will more carefully scrutinize what is to be done in his office at the suggestion of Members of Congress than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee one or two questions. It is the purpose of this paragraph to prohibit in the future the insertion in the Record of matter that is not germane, unless it is spoken here on the floor. Will not all material have to go somewhere before it is published in the Record? Will not this paragraph require the submission of all material to some one in authority?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. And the one in authority will determine whether or not it is germane?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is about as strong as the gentleman can make it by indirection. He might, perhaps, provide for an editor and provide that nothing shall be published until the editor has approved it; but the proposed law is that nothing shall be published in the Record that is not germane unless it is spoken here. If it is not germane, it has to go back to the Committee on Printing for privilege. Will the question of germaneness be entirely within the province of the Member printing? I think not. It seems to me that there is some one provided for here. It is certainly the intention of the bill that this material shall all be submitted to some one.

Mr. BARNHART. It shall be submitted to the Public Printer.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly; and if he has any doubt about it—

Mr. BARNHART. The Public Printer is under penalty to see that the law is enforced.

Mr. BUTLER. If he has any doubt about it, it goes back to the Committee on Printing, and that will determine it.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is perhaps as strong as we can make it, unless we provide for an editor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The provision on page 92 provides that no speech not delivered in either House shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unless read in order in either House. If it is not delivered in the House, how is it going to be read in order in the House? I do not understand that. The idea of getting leave to print is that it shall not be read in order, but shall be inserted under the leave to print.

Mr. BARNHART. This does not refer to a speech of a Member at all, and yet if a Member should secure time to deliver an address, and he saw fit to read the remarks of some one else, he could read any sort of a speech into the Record that the House would permit.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I refer to a very common practice in the House. I get leave to extend my remarks upon some given subject. I do not actually deliver that speech in the House. I extend my remarks, but as I understand this proviso, a speech which under those circumstances would not be delivered, can not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless it has been read in order in the House.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will refer to line 8, on page 92, he will find this language:

Or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want to ask about that alternative also. Of course if it is not delivered in the House, it can not be read in the House. Must I take that speech before it is printed down to the Committee on Printing and get its O. K. before it can be printed in the Record?

Mr. BARNHART. Is the gentleman asking me?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will refer to the beginning of the paragraph, in line 23, on page 91, he will find this proviso:

Provided, That either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length.

The next provision follows and places a limitation upon that by providing:

Provided further, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is this to be the form of procedure? If I get leave to print and then do not read that speech in order in the House—

Mr. BARNHART. Not a speech. This does not refer to a speech. It has reference to a printed address, book, or something of that kind.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know about that. It says no speech not delivered in either House.

Mr. BARNHART. That means an address delivered outside by some one else who is not a Member of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If this is what is referred to, it calls for some amendment, because as it is written, it is broad enough to include every situation that I have presented in the questions that I have asked the Chairman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If the language here refers only to Members of the House, it would not be in the bill at all, would it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not understand.

Mr. FESS. The bill says no address or speech not delivered in either House. If the address is delivered by some one who is not a Member of the House, it could not have been delivered in the House, and it must refer to some one else, not a Member of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why? If I get leave to print, I do not deliver the speech in the House.

Mr. BUTLER. That might be by a Member himself outside of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be, but it can also refer to a Member who gets leave to print a speech in the Record.

Mr. FESS. Suppose the gentleman were to deliver a speech at Richmond, which is not delivered here?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understand perfectly well that this language controls that situation, but it also specifically applies to a case in which a Member secures leave to print. When a Member obtains leave to print he does not deliver that speech in the House, nor does he read it in order in the House. He puts it in the Record. This language is broad enough to cover precisely that situation, and I ask the chairman of the committee if he intends by this language that after a Member secures leave to print from the House he must go before the Committee on Printing and secure their O. K. before his speech can be printed in the Record?

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is the situation that I am presenting, and it is one of interest to all the Members. If the language used is intended to refer to speeches other than those of a Member under the leave to print, then this language should be in some wise amended. In its present form it is too broad and limits the rights of the Members to an extent possibly not contemplated by the committee.

Mr. BARNHART. Would not the objection be cured by inserting a comma after the word "speech," in line 4. I think that would put it more clearly.

Mr. MOORE. Would the gentleman object to having stricken out, line 7, after "unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing," and insert "shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless permission shall have first been obtained in either House"?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That would be satisfactory. The amendment can be made in that connection or in the connection above. I think the gentleman's suggestion would entirely meet the situation.

Mr. MOORE. It is surely confusing as it is printed.

Mr. BARNHART. I am not sure but by that change it would put us back exactly where we now are.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No—

Mr. BARNHART. That is exactly what you have now.

Mr. MOORE. If this is clear, the only new thing you have is to obtain permission of the Committee on Printing, which is the new feature.

Mr. BARNHART. The new feature in this provision, as the committee tried to fix it, is this: When reprint matter is offered, when a Member rises and asks for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an editorial or even a speech delivered by some man in the gentleman's State of Texas, for instance, it is intended to limit that, and I referred to several instances in my remarks a while ago where speeches have been inserted in the Record which by no stretch of the imagination or consistency can have any place therein. Now, when a Member rises and asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks, and states what it is, under the provision here it would then have to be referred to the Committee on Printing, and if they decide that it would be all right they report favorably.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What the gentleman desires to do is to impede the insertion of matter not actually a part of the debate on the floor of the House?

Mr. BARNHART. That is certainly our intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And it is a very good intention, too.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend from Texas that I am in hearty accord with the idea of correcting abuses, but I must say that this language, unless in some wise it is limited, is broad enough to bring about a resulting annoyance to the Members without accomplishing any useful result. Suppose that this bill should be enacted into law and a Member should secure leave to print. He will not deliver that speech in the House, nor will he read it in order in the House. Hence under the present language, before the Member can avail himself of his leave to print and publish his speech in the Record, he must go before the Committee on Printing and have them make a report. After the leave to print has been obtained a Member should not be required to secure further leave from the Committee on Printing. Hence I say that is a matter of interest to every Member of the House.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say in reply to the gentleman that I rather think that that course would have to be resorted to.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman think we ought to do that? Does he think that every time a Member of this House secures leave to extend his remarks he must submit those remarks to the Committee on Printing and obtain a favorable report from that committee before his speech can be printed in the Record?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say to the gentleman it will have a tendency to stop this flood of useless nonpolitical matter; and if so, I think it would be a pretty good thing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This language would not stop that at all. It would merely put the Members to an additional and vexatious trouble.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That will stop it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; because when I obtain leave to print I apprehend that the Committee on Printing would hesitate to put a veto upon a permit derived from the House. The Member would be reasonably certain to secure a favorable report. But having secured from the House the necessary authority to print his remarks, he ought not to be required to apply to a committee of the House for a ratification of that power.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There must be some approval to pass on the subject of germaneness.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In this connection?

Mr. MOORE. In reference to the question of germaneness, that seems to me to be covered by the preceding proviso. If the gentleman will read that, he will find that it must be germane. The only question is as to the authority to determine—

Mr. SAUNDERS. He first secures the authority. I wish to have the attention of the committee fixed on the meaning of the language used. He first, I say, secures the authority to extend his remarks. Thereafter, in conformity to that authority, he writes his speech for publication. Under the language under consideration he must then take this speech before the Committee on Printing and secure a report authorizing its publication before it can be printed in the Record. This, I say, a Member should not be required to do.

Mr. MOORE. Get the consent of the committee? I do not so understand. I understand the committee says it is not, but all of the gentlemen who have been following this know it makes possible that procedure.

Mr. BARNHART. Such is not the intention of the committee at all if a Member had authority to extend his remarks. Now, on page 92, line 4, after the word "speech," strike out "not delivered in either House" and insert "by other than the person requesting leave to insert the same."

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is all right.

Mr. BARNHART. That would protect it. I send the amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That will make it doubly clear.

Mr. MOORE. That is just as to outside matter not originating with the Member?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 4, after the word "speech" in line 4, strike out the words "not delivered in either House" and insert "by other than the person requesting leave to insert the same."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I see the difficulty that gentlemen desire to obviate, but one of the greatest abuses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if it is abuse at all—and I do not express an opinion about that—is if a Member of the House goes away from here and makes a political speech or some other kind of a speech he comes back and asks leave to insert it in the RECORD. This amendment permits that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Suppose that is made to read in this way, namely, by striking out the words "not delivered." What was the proposed amendment? Does it say "delivered by some person other than a Member of the House"?

Mr. FESS. Other than the person making the request.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I like the idea of declining to print speeches not made on the floor of the House. My idea is that the RECORD ought to be made a record of the proceedings here and nothing more.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to carry it out, all he has to do is to sit in the House and object. If a Member asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD, that could be objected to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is trying to obviate the disagreeable necessity of doing that. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think that the RECORD would be vastly improved and a much more edifying and interesting publication if it were so confined, and would be more thoroughly read, by Members at least?

Mr. MANN. To be candid, there are times when I read speeches delivered in the House when I think the speech which is delivered is better than extraneous matter, and then there are many times when I think the extraneous matter in speeches which Members insert very much improves the speeches.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is undoubtedly true. Those things are available to any Member. He can get them without putting the expense of printing them on the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 7, after the word "unless," strike out all of lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert the words "permission shall have first been obtained in either House."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, that surely would result in the present practice. It would leave the door as wide open as it is now to all sorts of matter going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not consider that as any restriction on existing privileges whatever. And if that is adopted it would shear the entire provision of any possibility to regulate the matter as to preventing occasional abuse, namely, the privilege of extending remarks by throwing the bars down.

Mr. MOORE. While the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] was on his feet I asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] the question whether it was the purpose to have these particular matters referred to the Committee on Printing, and he said it was not. And it was because of that statement I offered this amendment. It appeared to me, as it seemed to appear to the gentleman from Virginia, that it would be a matter of much circumlocution to come into the House for the privilege of extending one's remarks and inserting a speech that was worthy of printing and then have to go to the Committee on Printing to obtain its assent. There should be some responsibility on the Committee on Printing to require information at the time the request is made as to whether the matter was germane or not or whether it was proper to print.

Mr. BARNHART. With the gentleman's permission, if the committee has not been able to classify the difference between these two provisions it is because of lack of ability to do so, because the purpose of it was to make them perfectly distinct and clear, inasmuch as the second was to be a limitation on the first. If it is the opinion of the committee that it does place any censorship over the extension of actual remarks of a Member, it should not do so except if some Member would get permission to extend his remarks and then indulge in a diatribe like the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to, and it would

be up to the Public Printer to refer it to the committee as to whether or not such matter would be germane.

Mr. MOORE. Now, let me put a case in point. I would like the attention of the chairman of the committee in order to see if we understand each other. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] makes a speech down at Richmond on good roads, and it is deemed worthy by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the address made by his colleague, Judge SAUNDERS, of Virginia, at Richmond, on the subject referred to, and the consent of the House is granted. Under this paragraph, as we have it, it would appear that that address of Judge SAUNDERS would have to be read in either House, or authorized by it, after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing. That is to say, if I had sought to have the address of the gentleman from Virginia printed, it being a matter which seemed to be proper and worthy to be printed, I would first have to go to the Committee on Printing and obtain its assent before I asked permission of the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say no.

Mr. MOORE. Then this language certainly is not clearly understood by some of us.

Mr. BARNHART. It would be offered to the House and referred to the Committee on Printing, and O. K'd by the Committee on Printing, and passed as a privileged resolution, as other matters are passed on report from the Committee on Printing; and I am sure no Committee on Printing would undertake to eliminate from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of the kind referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. On the other hand, it would have authority to eliminate such a speech as the gentleman referred to as having assailed the character of a private individual who had no means of equally public reply.

Mr. MOORE. I would stop that. Then after the unanimous consent was given, could it be printed?

Mr. BARNHART. It would go to the committee and be acted upon and a reprint ordered.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's understanding is that after I had obtained the consent of the House to print the speech of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] then I would have to go to the Committee on Printing and obtain its consent. This seems an unnecessary hardship on the Member.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman that when the gentleman got unanimous consent to insert the speech in the RECORD the Speaker would refer it to the Committee on Printing, just as other requests are referred here in the matter of the printing of documents. It would go to the Committee on Printing and be reported back to the House favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. MOORE. That would necessitate delay, and it might not all be done in the same day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 9, after the word "Printing," insert the words "and it shall be the duty of the Public Printer to enforce the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that would be a good thing to do—to make it the duty of the Public Printer to enforce the provisions of the paragraph?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee will accept it. It simply emphasizes what has already been said and makes it perfectly clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12665. An act to increase the limit of cost of the public building at La Junta, Colo.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 60, PAR. 6. The Public Printer shall furnish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows and shall supply gratuitously no others in addition thereto:

To the Vice President and each Senator, 88 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, 60 copies, to be supplied daily as originally published or in bound form as each may order, but not to exceed five sets each shall be bound, unless specifically requested by the Vice President, Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner entitled to the same; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner there shall be furnished 3 additional copies of the daily RECORD, 1 to be delivered at his residence, 1 at the Capitol, and 1 to be reserved by the Public Printer in unstitched form to be promptly bound in paper when each semimonthly index shall be issued; to each standing committee of Congress, 1 daily copy; to the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and to the Clerk and the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies each, in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 20 daily copies each, for office use; to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, 10 copies in daily or bound form and not to exceed 20 daily copies, for the use of the Senate; and to the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 30 daily copies for the use of the House of Representatives; to the President, 4 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the Chief Justice, each of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the marshal and the clerk of said court, each 1 copy of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the governor of each State and Territory, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the official reporters of the Senate and the House, each 2 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the libraries of the Senate and the House, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and not to exceed 20 bound copies each; to the superintendents of the Senate and House document rooms, each 3 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the Library of Congress, not to exceed 110 copies of the daily RECORD for its own use and for distribution, through the Smithsonian Institution, to the legislative chambers of such foreign Governments as may agree to send to the United States current copies of their parliamentary record or like publications, such publications, when received, to be deposited in the Library of Congress, and not to exceed 110 copies of the bound RECORD for its own use and for international exchange; to the Librarian of Congress, 1 copy each of the daily and the bound RECORD, which he is authorized to furnish to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard, which shall be deposited in the Department of State; to the Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Naval Observatory, each 1 daily and 1 bound copy of the RECORD; to the Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and each branch thereof, and to each State or Territorial home for either Federal or Confederate soldiers and sailors or for their widows and orphans, 1 copy of the daily RECORD; to the superintendent of documents, a sufficient number of copies of the daily and bound RECORD to enable him to make distribution to depository libraries; to each of the legations of the United States abroad, 1 copy of the daily RECORD, to be sent through the Secretary of State; to each foreign legation in Washington whose Government extends a like courtesy to our legations abroad, 1 copy of the daily RECORD, to be sent through the Secretary of State and furnished upon his requisition; to each newspaper correspondent whose name appears in the Congressional Directory and who makes application therefor, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and one copy of the bound RECORD, the same to be sent to his office address, or elsewhere in the city of Washington, as he may direct; to the press galleries of the Senate and the House, respectively, 2 copies each of the daily RECORD and 1 copy each of the bound RECORD; to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, at Manila, and to the Governor of Porto Rico, at San Juan, each 10 copies of the daily RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, on page 93, line 4, after the word "residence," the words "or his office."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 4, after the word "residence," insert the words "or his office."

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman any objection to letting these daily copies be delivered at the office of a Member?

Mr. BARNHART. None whatever.

Mr. MANN. I supposed not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that you provide that the Parliamentary Hansard that we get from Canada shall be deposited in the Department of State. Why should it not go to the Congressional Library? We recently passed a resolution to permit an exchange. I do not know what they want it for in the State Department. I think it ought to be in the Congressional Library.

Mr. BARNHART. The Library of Congress gets a set under existing law, and it is satisfactory to the Secretary of State. This is a provision that is comparatively new. It was passed in 1912, and the Secretary of State gets a copy and the Congressional Library a copy, and both are supplied.

Mr. MANN. Very well. When the law was passed the statement was made that we did not have an exchange with the Canadian Government at all, and this was to permit an ex-

change. Of course, if they get a set in the Congressional Library, that is all they want, but I am quite confident—and I would put my judgment up against that of the clerk of the committee—that when we passed that resolution two years ago we authorized this exchange. May I ask another question?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Where do the departments get their sets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from? Where is the authorization of a set of the daily RECORD to go to each of the departments?

Mr. BARNHART. They requisition for the amount they want; it is charged to their printing allotment, and the bound set is furnished to each depository library.

Mr. MANN. The departments now, you say, when they want a set of the daily RECORD, have it charged to their printing allowance?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. They requisition for it if they want it.

Mr. MANN. Why is it not charged to the Interstate Commerce Commission on their printing allowance, and to the United States National Museum and the Civil Service Commission on their printing allowances, and to the Naval Observatory? You provide here for the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Naval Observatory. They all have printing allowances. Of course, do not understand that I am making any criticism. I am just asking for information. If they are to continue to get these, I have nothing further to say. I do not care how they get them. I asked the question because I did not find any place in here where it was provided that the RECORD should be delivered to the different departments. Of course they have to have the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. These departments to which the gentleman refers have not depository libraries, but the other departments do have depository libraries.

Mr. MANN. They do not, any of them, have depository libraries.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, yes; each executive department has.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by "depository libraries"?

Mr. BARNHART. They are given one copy of each Government publication for their libraries.

Mr. MANN. That does not include the daily RECORD. The daily RECORD is not sent to the depositories.

Mr. BARNHART. It includes the bound RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes. I am not talking about the bound RECORD. I do not care whether they get the bound RECORD or not. It may be suitable to stack up in piles. I am sure that they do not all take it.

Mr. BARNHART. The bill provides that they shall have a copy of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Where is it? I do not say it is not there, but it is not in this section. I could not find it.

Mr. BARNHART. At the top of page 95, it is provided—

To the superintendent of documents, a sufficient number of copies of the daily and bound RECORD to enable him to make distribution to depository libraries.

Mr. MANN. The department libraries are not depository libraries in that sense. There is one in each congressional district and two at large in each State.

Mr. BARNHART. Section 64, paragraph 1, provides as follows:

The libraries of each executive department in Washington, D. C., the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, each State and Territory, the District of Columbia, the Government of the Philippine Islands at Manila, the Government of Porto Rico at San Juan, the Pan American Union, each land-grant college, the office of the superintendent of documents, the Historical Library and Museum of Alaska, the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Mass., and in addition thereto not to exceed one library for each congressional district and Territory and two libraries at large for each State, to be designated by the superintendent of documents under such rules and regulations as are approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, are hereby constituted depositories of Government publications, and all designations now existing shall be permanent, except as otherwise provided in this section.

Mr. MANN. I take it all back. It is under that provision that they get the daily RECORD?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend page 92, line 21, by striking out the word "sixty" and inserting the word "eighty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 21, strike out the word "sixty" and insert the word "eighty."

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Indiana know how much that would cost? I think the demand for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is so great that we ought to increase the number allotted to each Member.

Mr. BARNHART. It would add one-third to the present cost of the Record.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it would not add one-third to the present cost, but it would increase by one-third the number allotted to each Member.

Mr. BARNHART. The cost of the Record is something like \$1,000,000 per Congress. Of course, that includes the Senate.

Mr. MANN. About the only increased cost for this, of course, would be for paper, ink, and printing. It would not increase the cost of composition. Now, we are going to reduce the size of the Record, and make it more readable, under this provision. Since I have been here I think we have doubled the allotment of Records to Members. I think we used to get 29 copies apiece. Perhaps I am mistaken about that. I think there is a much greater demand for the Record than there used to be. The population of the Members' districts is considerably increased. I am not inclined to be extravagant, but I believe it would be a proper thing to increase the number of Records allotted to us.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee went over that phase of the matter and made some inquiry among Members. As far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, he does not have demands for all his Records, except where the list of names to whom Records are sent is continued from term to term. Some years ago I found myself without Records enough to supply the demand that kept coming in, and I adopted this method: At the opening of a session of Congress I sent a letter to each one to whom the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD had been sent by me in the previous Congress, and said that if he wanted the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD continued please to notify me at once, and if not I would consider that he did not want it continued, and I would send the copy going to him to some one else who was asking for it.

The result is that since then I find I very rarely have requests for all my CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. I think the draft on me for this very important session of Congress is probably 51 Records. It was so a few days ago. I do not recall that there have been any additional requests since. I can see how, if Members permit their old lists to stand and make no effort to ascertain whether or not the Record is really acceptable, they will have an increasing list. I have constituents in my district to whom I am sending the Record who might consider it an offense if they wrote to me and told me they wanted it stopped, that they did not care to read it, and that I might send it to some one else. But I believe that if the method I have adopted were adopted by the membership generally we would find we had an ample supply of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

Mr. MANN. Ah, of course the gentleman states his own case. Each one is apt to look at it from his own viewpoint. This is my practice: I want about 8 or 10 copies of the daily Record delivered at my office every day for use. I do not want them promised out in advance, and they are not sent out. I make use of them regularly. At the beginning of every session—

Mr. BARNHART. Probably there is not another Member of Congress who makes use of 10 daily Records in that way.

Mr. MANN. I have talked with a good many Members of Congress who do the same thing. Every few days something happens in the House and somebody wants to know about that particular thing, and you can send the Record and let them know about it. I am much more particular even than the gentleman from Indiana, and I have no doubt he is more particular than many. The gentleman writes and asks them if they want the Record. At the beginning of each session of Congress I strike most of them off the list, and if they do not write and kick they do not get it; but many of them do, and I never have been able to supply the demand for the Record. I do not think I have an unusual demand.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that he is one of the most conspicuous Members in the activities of Congress?

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. BARNHART. That his name is in the newspapers every day as having led or opposed this and that legislation; that he is the leader of his party; and that what applies to him in the matter of requests for CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS by people interested in him would not apply to another man in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I do not think the personal equation enters into it at all.

Mr. BARNHART. I think it does.

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman that when I retire from Congress—and that is liable to happen—and if I ever ask some one for a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it will be, in a

measure, to see what the gentleman from Illinois is starting on the floor of the House.

Mr. MANN. I will say this, that if the gentleman ever gets turned out of Congress and puts in his time reviewing what I have done in the House as it goes along, it will be of vastly great benefit to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNHART. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. MANN. I am afraid he does not do it now.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, I will say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. But seriously, now, I do not often send the Record to people outside of my district. I have two or three times sent a Record to some defeated Member of Congress, but the demand for Records is by people who want to use them. It is not merely for idle reading. They follow the Record. I find when I go home—and I read the Record here every day—that I not infrequently run across somebody who seems to know more about the Record than I do, who religiously reads it; and I think it is a good thing.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They can not do anything else then.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman asked what would be the increased cost to supply 20 additional copies of the daily Record to each Member. It would cost \$72,500, on the basis of the present cost of the Record.

Mr. MANN. Of course that will only be if the Records are sent out.

Mr. BARNHART. If the allotment is printed, I take it there will be a good many corded up and never sent out, as now.

Mr. MANN. I think you correct that, do you not? You change that?

Mr. BARNHART. We limit it to five copies of the bound Record, under the present arrangement, but further than that I do not know of any change. If I have 60 copies coming to me, and some one asks me for a Record and I give an order for it, they will send the back numbers, and if they do not they go to the junk heap.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better correct that. I only have them send the Record from the date that the order comes in.

Mr. BARNHART. What is the gentleman going to do with the balance of the 60 Records to his credit?

Mr. MANN. Those that they do not keep to be bound I have sent to my office, and I send them out as called for. That is a good practice, and I advise the gentleman to follow it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I was interested in the discussion between the two gentlemen as to the circulation of this great daily among the people of their respective districts. I would like to know how many people subscribe and pay for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD according to the rates printed in it.

Mr. BARNHART. In the United States?

Mr. SLAYDEN. In the United States and the Philippines.

Mr. BARNHART. In the Sixtieth Congress, first session, there were 110 subscribers; in the second session of the Sixtieth Congress, 145; in the Sixty-first Congress, first session, 110. There were 95 monthly subscribers in the first session Sixty-first Congress, in addition to the 110 session subscribers. In the second session of the Sixty-first Congress there were 160 subscribers. In the six years of the Sixtieth Congress, Sixty-first Congress, and Sixty-second Congress there was a total of 638 subscribers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That does not indicate any great demand among the people for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It does seem to me that the distribution of 60 copies by each Member ought to supply all the literature of that sort that is needed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, probably my calls for the Record would not be a very good index to go by, but I have not been able to supply all of the calls that have come to me. I have 56 newspapers in my district, and I can not supply all of them.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman sends the Record voluntarily to them, does he not?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. When I first came to Congress I discovered, and I presume it is the experience of others, as the man whom I succeeded was of the opposite political faith, and there never had been one of my political faith representing that district, the people were anxious to see what their Representative was going to do, and I had demands for more Records than I had copies to supply. But this demand has been growing less ever since, and it may be on account of their disappointment in their Member of Congress, on account of his lack of activity. But from time to time, and I take it it is the experience of a good many Members that their constituents become satisfied with their floor work and do not care to read about it any more.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he had the same experience in sending copies to newspapers that a gentleman from another State had, whose name I shall not mention. He had a great many weekly papers to whom he sent the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until he found that they were wrapping the mail in them.

Mr. FESS. I have not had that experience, but I am frank to say I do not know whether this distribution I have made to the newspapers is a valuable one or not. I supposed that it was. On the other hand, I am also sending one copy to each college, and I have eight colleges in my district. Then I try to send one to each separate high-school library. I do not have enough to go around. Probably if I took the time to analyze the list I might reduce them; but I frankly state to you that the allotment as now allowed does not permit me to give to all these general institutions, and therefore I have not been able to respond to individuals at all.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio my own experience in the matter of the distribution of the RECORD. When I came here I did precisely what he says he has done. I did not send the RECORD to all newspapers in my district because there were not enough RECORDS to go around. In the next campaign I went into the offices of the newspapers, and they were frank to tell me that they did not read the news as old as that brought by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but they used them as wrappers for their own papers. I dropped those particular journals the next session and took up a new list, and found the same experience there. Then I adopted the plan of sending it to people who asked for it, and I have found that the only part of my constituency which takes a persistent interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are the farmers living without quick access to the newspapers, and not the people in the towns and at colleges. They are the men who live in the remote rural country. I fancy they are the only people who are interested. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have used all of the gentleman's time, I ask that it be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute more.

Mr. FESS. I want to confess that I have not been able to furnish any RECORDS to the farmers. Probably I have made a wrong distribution; I do not know. I would hesitate to vote for the increase in the expense, as the gentleman has stated, but at the same time I would like to have a larger allotment if it is not too much of a strain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, at the end of line 15, page 93, by striking out the word "thirty" and inserting the word "fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 15, strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "fifty."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the present allotment of copies for daily use for the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is 50. Am I correctly informed?

Mr. BARNHART. No such information has come to the committee.

Mr. MOORE. I find that 50 copies are daily assigned to the Doorkeeper, and if we were to fix 30, as proposed here, there would be a reduction of 20 copies.

Mr. BARNHART. The present law is 30, and if any official of the House is receiving 50, and the law authorizes him only to have 30, the committee knows nothing about that method of procedure. There has been no request to the committee for any increase. The bill has been submitted to all of the officers of the House. I do not know that they have read it, but there has been no request of that sort to the committee.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to say to the gentleman and to the committee that frequent requests are made for copies of the RECORD by Members of the House. It may be true that the gentleman's constituents are not always interested in the RECORD, and it may be true that the constituents of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] are not always interested in the RECORD, but there are other Members—

Mr. BARNHART. I am not clear on the gentleman's position. These 50 are issued to the Doorkeeper of the House. What use has he for them?

Mr. MOORE. I am informed that 50 copies are left here each morning for the use of the Members of the House on the floor.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And I am quite sure of my own knowledge that there are times when the supply of daily RECORDS for the

use of the Members is very quickly exhausted. We may want to read one of our own speeches, unlike the constituents of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who spoke a moment ago. If nobody else is interested in our speeches, it is true that sometimes we are ourselves and like to look them up.

Mr. BARNHART. One is supplied for each Member of the House every morning.

Mr. MOORE. That is true, but frequently demands are made here by Members during the day in excess of the 50. This question arose, because 15 minutes ago I had occasion to ask for a copy of the RECORD which contained a speech made during the war-tax discussion, and I was informed that the supply was exhausted. I believe the date was September 25. The Clerk said to me he hoped that I was not going to ask for the RECORD of September 25 because there had been a heavy demand for that and all recent requests had been turned down. They had no more of them. I got another copy of another date, which served as well, and that is what brings this matter to my attention now.

Mr. BARNHART. That is one particular instance, but does the gentleman from Pennsylvania believe that these allotments ought to be increased generally to cover such instances?

Mr. MOORE. I am just informed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that he was unable to get a copy of the RECORD here which contained the war-tax speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Naturally there is pressure and demand for these speeches at times. I have frequently had occasion to ask for copies here and have found the daily supply exhausted.

Mr. BARNHART. That is true in many other instances in Congress, but the committee tried to reach a happy medium in which all wants would be taken care of, and if we were to increase all along the line, to meet possible emergencies, the extra amount of printing that we would do would get us into the same rut that we are trying to get out of, and that is a great superfluity of documents that can not be used.

Mr. MOORE. I have in my hand now a cover of one of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS showing that 50 copies are delivered here to the Clerk of the House each day.

Mr. BARNHART. But the gentleman has been talking about the Doorkeeper and not the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MOORE. It is addressed to the Clerk of the House, care of Frank W. Collier, and it is a part of the assignment to the Doorkeeper as per this bill:

And to the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies in daily or bound form; and not to exceed 30 daily copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

That is a reduction of 20 copies per day.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will look at page 93, line 7, he will find this language, providing for a new division:

To the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and to the Clerk and the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies each, in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 20 daily copies each for office use.

Mr. MOORE. Does not that lead to confusion?

Mr. BARNHART. And further along the language to which he has just referred is clear. There is an abundance, it would seem to me. That makes 50 copies that now come here, according to the memorandum the gentleman has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAXN) there were—ayes 7, noes 20.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Have we any relationship with the Parliament of England by which we get the reports of the proceedings in Parliament in exchange for our proceedings? Do we get the reports from England?

Mr. BARNHART. The Library of Congress gets the International Exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 70. PAR. 1. The Public Printer shall, upon requisition of the superintendent of documents, who is hereby charged with the distribution of the Revised Statutes and Supplements thereto, print, bind, and deliver to the latter as many volumes of the Revised Statutes of the United States and the Supplements thereto as may be needed for distribution to State supreme court libraries, to United States courts not already supplied, to supply deficiencies and offices newly created, and to be sold by him under the provisions of section 58 of this act: *Provided*, That the superintendent of documents shall, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, distribute to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in such Congress not previously supplied one copy of the Revised Statutes of the United States and the Supplements thereto: *Provided further*, That no Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner during his term or terms of service shall receive more than one copy of such Revised Statutes and Supplements thereto.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 96, line 5, after the first word "to," strike out "State supreme court libraries" and insert "the library of the court of last resort of each State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 70. *AR. 2.* After the close of each Congress the Secretary of State shall have edited and printed the Statutes at Large enacted by that Congress, and the Public Printer shall deliver to the superintendent of documents as many bound copies as may be needed to meet the following distribution: To the President of the United States, 4 copies, one of which shall be for the library of the Executive Office; to the Vice President, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, 1 copy; to the librarian of the Senate, for the use of Senators, not to exceed 120 copies; to the librarian of the House, for the use of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, not to exceed 200 copies; to the Department of State, including those for the use of legations and consulates, not to exceed 380 copies; to the Treasury Department, including those for the use of officers of customs, not to exceed 300 copies; to the War Department, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Navy Department, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Department of the Interior, including those for the use of surveyors general and registers and receivers of public-land offices, not to exceed 250 copies; to the Post Office Department, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Interstate Commerce Commission, not to exceed 10 copies; to the Civil Service Commission, 4 copies; to the Department of Justice, including those for the use of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and the judges and the officers of the United States and Territorial courts, not to exceed 800 copies; to the Department of Agriculture, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Department of Commerce, not to exceed 300 copies; to the Department of Labor, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Smithsonian Institution, 2 copies; to the Pan American Union, 2 copies; to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, at Manila, 2 copies; to the Governor of Porto Rico, at San Juan, 2 copies; to the Government Printing Office, 2 copies; and a sufficient number of copies for distribution to the library of the court of last resort of each State.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the Statutes at Large are to be distributed, one to each Senator, Representative, and so forth. Then, having given each Senator one, the gentleman proposes to give to the Librarian of the Senate 120 copies for the use of the Senators. I expect that is the existing law, but what is the object, if the gentleman happens to know, of this extravagant distribution of these pamphlets to the Senators? They can not have any use for them. I think the gentleman is satisfied with giving to the librarian of the House 200 copies. Of course that does not go all the way around. I do not know what the Senators will do with the extra copies of the Statutes at Large.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the committee's only means of information was by calling on these different officials and inquiring if the present enactment was sufficient and if they were really needed; and in many instances numbers were changed by the officials both of the House and Senate. Sometimes they increased, sometimes decreased, and we took the report of these officials that the librarians need that amount; at least they did not report to the contrary, and that is the basis of procedure on the part of the committee in fixing the amount, leaving it as I think like the present law. No, the Senate has an increase of 20 and that was on the demand of the librarian.

Mr. MANN. What do they do with them?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, I do not know, but the committee could not inquire of every official appearing before it what is done with the documents allotted to him.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know the Senate Committee on Printing always gets the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Printing and appoints the clerk to the Committee on Printing and probably has a little more influence than the House side has. The result is that Senators get more than two copies of the Statutes at Large and Members of the House get less than two, having no more use for them than we have. My observation is that they do not examine them any more carefully than we do. But that is neither here nor there. I want to make a suggestion to the gentleman—

Mr. BARNHART. I will explain that briefly, as I want to keep the Committee on Printing clear in the estimation of the Committee of the Whole House—

Mr. MANN. I am not complaining of the committee in reference to that.

Mr. BARNHART (continuing). It is this: The librarian of the Senate said there is a constant and general demand that they might have a copy at the home office and one in Washington. Our librarian here made no such request, and when such a request is made of our committee and they say that there is a demand for it, that they want it, if we did not put it in the bill it would probably go on in the Senate anyhow, and the short cut was to put it in here.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows they do not make any more use of the Statutes at Large in their home offices, which they do not have as a rule, than Members of the House do; that not as many Senators have a home office as Members of the House. That is neither here nor there, but I want to make a suggestion—

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman understands that while he is not permitted to offer any reflection on any Member here, he can appreciate what the gentleman from Illinois has said that they probably have no more use for them, but certain Members of the Senate think they have more use for documents, and so forth, than Members of the House. Of that I am fully convinced.

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing to give copies of the statutes to people who make use of them, but I would like to make this suggestion for future effect: We print the public laws and private laws now in separate volumes, and it is an expensive publication, as the gentleman knows. The private laws, in the main, consist of omnibus pension bills. I do not believe there is any necessity of distributing private laws with the same degree of liberality that there is of public laws to every department and branch of the Government where we send the public laws.

I do not know whether you could effect economy in that way or not, but I would request the prayerful consideration of the gentleman from Indiana to the idea of dispensing with the filling up of so many libraries with volumes of private laws which no one ever looks at. They may look at the proclamations sometimes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 71. The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the bound copies of the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained in all the courts of the United States and of the several States therein. The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall contain all laws and concurrent and joint resolutions passed by Congress, and also all conventions, treaties, proclamations, and agreements: *Provided*, That neither the Revised Statutes of the United States, nor the Statutes at Large, nor the session laws shall be published in any newspaper at the expense of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 100, after the figures "71," in line 4, down to and including the word "therein," in line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, lines 4 and 8, strike out the following language:

"The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the bound copies of the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained in all the courts of the United States and of the several States therein."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is important whether it goes out or stays in, but this is not where it belongs. It is not in this law that we ought to fix what is evidence in the courts. That is carried by the law relating to the courts. It was up recently in the codification bill which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] had charge of, and I believe it is a provision in the law now, and it is also carried in the other law. Is this in the identical language of the printing law now?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I believe that the slip laws are evidence in court. My recollection is that they are. We print a slip law and a pamphlet law in bound volume of the Statutes at Large. The printing act makes the bound copies of the pamphlet laws evidence. I think the statute that governs on the subject—although I may be mistaken—makes the slip law evidence, and when we print one of these copies here by authority of Congress it does not have to be a certified copy nor do we have to wait until it is printed in pamphlet form before it can be introduced in evidence.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, does it say it shall be evidence in the courts of the States?

Mr. BARNHART. In the courts of the United States and the several States therein.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is the present law, I suppose, and no objection to it on that score, but I do not see exactly how Congress can pass an act declaring what shall be evidence in the courts of a State. The Constitution of the United States provides that the Constitution and all laws made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land and be binding. Of course, it is the law in the State, but how the Congress of the United States can declare what shall be evidence in the courts of a State passes my comprehension.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield? Most States have a section in their code saying that public laws and acts of

another State shall be evidence when printed under the public authority of that State, of the laws of that State.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly. The States can do it, but how can Congress say what shall be evidence in the State of Missouri?

Mr. BORLAND. Printed under the authority of Congress. I think that is true in most State courts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is your State law?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, here is an attempt to say by Congress what shall be evidence in a State court.

Mr. MANN. Suppose a State did not permit any method of approving the law, they could not nullify an act of Congress in that way?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not at all. If the gentleman will pardon me, as I caught the reading of it—I do not have it before me—it is not a declaration that it shall be the law in the State courts.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it is evidence. But if you leave it to the State how the law should be approved, and the State did not permit any method of approving the law, that would be to set aside the law in the State courts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would be a question for the court itself to pass upon in the absence of a legislative act.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the absence of a legislative act the courts themselves could determine what was evidence. It is possibly an academic discussion. I do not want to take up any time with it, but I wanted to call attention, Mr. Chairman, to what seems to me to be a very peculiar thing to do, in that the Congress of the United States should declare by legislation what should be evidence in the State courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 72. The following shall be printed and distributed as provided in this act:

(1) Annual reports of the officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the annual reports required by law to be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, by the officers thereof shall be printed as congressional documents of the session to which they are to be submitted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Section 72 says:

The following shall be printed and distributed as provided in this act.

How is that, now? Is it the valuation distribution which is referred to there?

Mr. BARNHART. No. I will say this does not refer to valuation. This does not come to us through the folding room.

Mr. MANN. It says "printed and distributed as provided in this act."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The valuation only applies to the folding room.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken about that. It applies to certain documents. Where is it provided in this act that these shall be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. In section 44. It is a standing provision. It is the usual number.

Mr. MANN. That is what is intended by it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And it does not come under the valuation?

Mr. BARNHART. Not under the valuation.

Mr. MANN. It is difficult to tell from the reading. Section 44 provides for printing of documents by order of the House or the Senate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Paragraph 3, section 44, if the gentleman will look, will possibly cover it. It is on page 40.

Mr. MANN. That is to define what a Government publication is. I will not say there is not any provision in the bill covering it. The bill is a good one.

Mr. BARNHART. On page 42, section 46, line 20, it says:

Of the House numbered documents and reports, excepting reports on private bills and simple and concurrent resolutions, there shall be distributed—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) Book of Estimates: *Provided*, That the annual estimates of appropriations transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided by law shall be printed as a congressional document of the session to which they are submitted and be ready for delivery on the first day of each regular session of Congress: *Provided further*, That the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to have printed and bound in half morocco not to exceed 100 copies thereof for its own use.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to strike out the words "one hundred," on page 101, lines 6 and 7, and insert "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 101, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations tells me it is not necessary to have more than 10 copies of the Book of Estimates bound, as provided in this particular paragraph. He states he has never had more than that number bound in any one year, and it is at his suggestion that I have offered this amendment. It is simply in the interest of economy, because the additional number is not necessary.

Mr. BARNHART. We will accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee how many copies of the Book of Estimates this provides for printing?

The CHAIRMAN. That covers the usual number.

Mr. MANN. Five hundred for the House.

Mr. BARNHART. Thirteen hundred and forty-five.

Mr. BORLAND. What becomes of those?

Mr. BARNHART. They go to the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Are they sent to the document room or the folding room?

Mr. BARNHART. To the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Is there demand for that number of copies of the Book of Estimates?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. Of course, 500 go to libraries.

Mr. BORLAND. To what libraries?

Mr. BARNHART. To the depository libraries—to the departments and the other depository libraries.

Mr. BORLAND. That is, out of the 1,345?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. What has been the consumption of the remaining 800? Are they all gone?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee is not prepared to advise the gentleman from Missouri as to that.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me that that is a large number of copies of the Book of Estimates, which is a large book, and it must be expensive to print.

Mr. BARNHART. We had the superintendent of documents before us, and he went over all these matters very carefully, and he gave us a number of very liberal reductions. After taking 500 from the 1,345 it leaves barely more than one for each Member and Senator.

Mr. BORLAND. My experience is that each Member does not use one copy.

Mr. BARNHART. Even then it is necessary, and the provision is that there shall be that many.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, the gentleman from Indiana awhile ago referred me to paragraph 3 in section 46 for the authority fixing the distribution of these documents, and under that 500 go to the House folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. To the House folding room?

Mr. MANN. To the House document room; not to, exceed 500.

Mr. BORLAND. Does any portion of them go to the folding room?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. BORLAND. Where is the provision under which that number is fixed? I do not think I know where it is in the bill. The gentleman referred to "the usual number."

Mr. MANN. "The usual number" comes from the number which are distributed to the House and the Senate and to public depositories, or in some cases to the President and the executive departments. Certain documents by direction go in certain numbers. That is "the usual number" as to any document. It varies slightly.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice in section 70, paragraph 3, that there is an express enumeration of the number of copies of the pamphlet laws to be furnished to each one of these departments. Now, is there an enumeration somewhere of "the usual number," as it is called, of these other documents?

Mr. MANN. I do not think there is an enumeration at any place. That is the specific number provided for. Take this section 46, paragraph 3, that was referred to a little while ago:

Of the House numbered documents and reports, excepting reports on private bills and simple and concurrent resolutions, there shall be dis-

tributed, unbound, to the Senate document room, not to exceed 150 copies; to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, not to exceed 10 copies; to the House document room, not to exceed 500 copies; and to the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 20 copies—

And so forth.

Now, there are other provisions in the bill which require these same documents to go to certain other officials, and also to certain public depositories; and the total required for distribution makes it what they call "the usual number."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(3) Statement of appropriations: *Provided*, That the statement of all appropriations made during each session of Congress, including new offices created and the salaries of each, and salaries of the offices which are increased and the amounts of such increase authorized by the act of July 4, 1836, shall be prepared under the direction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and said statement shall show also the offices the salaries of which are reduced or omitted, and the amount of such reduction, and shall also contain a chronological history of the regular appropriation bills passed during the session for which it is prepared. The foregoing statement of appropriations shall be printed at the close of each regular session of Congress as a document thereof, and the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to have printed and bound in half morocco not to exceed 100 copies thereof for its own use.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 101, in line 13, after the word "thirty-six," insert the words "and amendments thereof."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that since the act of July 4, 1836, was passed, there have been two amendments, one adopted in 1888 and the other in 1897, relating to statements of appropriations. My attention was called to the fact, and it was suggested that this amendment ought to be adopted in order to preserve the requirements of the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, on page 101, after the word "prepared," insert the following: "and exhibit of amounts of contracts authorized by appropriation acts in addition to the appropriations made therein, and specific reference to all indefinite appropriations made at each session."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is exactly in accord with the mandatory act of July 19, 1897.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask to strike out the word "one," line 24, page 101, and insert the word "two," so as to make it read, "200 copies."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, page 101, strike out the word "one," at the beginning of the line, and insert the word "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what the purpose of the extra number is?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations states that 100 copies are not sufficient.

This past year he had either 120 or 125 bound, and they were necessary in order to make the proper distribution. This bill does not provide that any particular number of copies shall be bound, but says not exceeding a certain number shall be bound, and inasmuch as 100 are not sufficient, and only a sufficient number will be bound to supply the necessary number for

distribution, it is thought that the limit should be made 200 rather than 100.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an inquiry. Are these the only copies of this document that are printed?

Mr. BARNHART. The usual number in addition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed by the chairman of the committee that the usual number are printed, in addition to those here mentioned.

Mr. MANN. I venture to say you can send out to the document room now and find 300 copies that are unused.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will understand that these copies are distributed to the chairmen of the various committees, certainly the various appropriating committees, the heads of the departments, and the heads of important bureaus in the various departments.

Mr. MANN. I understand they get them anyhow. Of course, if they get them bound they are in a little better shape than if they get them here unbound.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are bound for permanent use and permanent filing.

Mr. MANN. They are of no special value after the year has gone by. They are for current use, mainly for current legislative use. I have no doubt that the clerk of the committee makes good use of them. I am frank to say that I think usually I get one of them, and it is very convenient. Yet I could have one bound myself. We have a large number going to waste undoubtedly now, however.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will yield, the committee could see no danger of any serious extravagance in this, because it is up to the Committee on Appropriations not to have more than it actually needs, and as it used more than 100 last year I think it is fair to assume that there will be no waste, and the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(12) Daily Consular and Trade Reports, Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to have printed, for distribution by the Department of Commerce, not to exceed 5,000 copies of any one issue of the Consular and Trade Reports, the distribution of which shall be confined to copies sent to consular officers and other Government officers for official use, to chambers of commerce and similar commercial organizations, to schools and colleges, to public libraries, to the press, and for the use of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in exchanges and replying to inquiries relative to foreign trade. Other copies shall be sold by the superintendent of documents at the rate of \$2.50 per annum: *Provided*, That that part of section 208 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by an act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor, approved February 14, 1903, authorizing the submission to Congress of the annual report known as the "Commercial Relations of the United States," is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 108, line 2, by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 2, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

Mr. BARNHART. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will consent to the reading of the balance of the section up to paragraph 73? That is as far as the committee intend to go this evening. It is just the next page, and then we might go back if we have any time.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to take it up to-night, and I am willing to have the section read, with the understanding that we may return to this paragraph for amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. The amendment will be considered as pending.

Mr. MANN. I have another amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Very well. With that understanding I will ask the Clerk to read up to 73, and then I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. MANN. You might ask unanimous consent to pass over this paragraph, with leave to return for amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; that is understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to pass over the paragraph just read, with the privilege of returning to it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

(16) Annals of the Astrophysical Observatory of the Smithsonian Institution: *Provided*, That not to exceed 1,500 copies are authorized to be printed for distribution by the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he wishes to discuss his amendment now?

Mr. MANN. No; I think not to-night.

Mr. BARNHART. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12665. An act to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks on the general political subject of the accomplishments of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on accomplishments of the present Congress. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which I shall not exercise, I want to say that if this bill which we are now considering, and which I suppose the gentleman from Wisconsin is favorable to, were a law, granting consent would do him no good.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Treasury Department. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 16, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Lake River, including Bachelors Slough, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 1176), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 19299) for the temporary relief of cotton growers of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the Panama-Pacific Dental Congress, to be held at San Francisco, Cal., August 30 to September 9, inclusive, 1915; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) providing for a national security commission; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 19300) for the relief of the heirs of Edward A. Scott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 19301) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 19302) granting a pension to David E. Stanwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 19303) for the relief of Emma Louise Du Bois, heir of Amos Towle; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19304) for the relief of Augusta Reiter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 19305) granting an increase of pension to Robert V. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19306) for the relief of Halvor Nilsen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 19307) to correct the military record of James P. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: Protest of W. H. Millard, of Lawton, Pa., against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of H. J. Fritz, of Hastings, Pa.; the Salberg Hotel, of Ridgway, Pa.; and B. E. Moon, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of F. L. Hall, manager of Dixie Theater, Uniontown, Pa., protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. Beachly, of Garrett; Henry Frazier, of Somerset; Dr. H. H. Miller, of Davidsville; Rev. W. Finke, of Boswell; and Robert Fogle, of Garrett, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against tax per horsepower on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David J. Reese, secretary of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, Philadelphia, Pa.; telegrams of the Hostetter Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and J. D. Armstrong Drug Co., Brownsville, Pa., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, New York City, protesting against tax on motion-picture theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DECKER: Petition of John W. Leake and other citizens of Missouri, relative to recognition for Dr. Frederick A. Cook; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DEITRICK: Petition of the Epworth League of Melrose, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of W. F. Werner and sundry citizens of the United States, protesting against tax on drugs and medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. A. Mills, Ed. E. Jenkins, J. L. Ashworth, L. E. Green, W. H. Johnson, and J. H. McCarty & Sons, of the sixth congressional district of Indiana, protesting against special revenue tax on drugs and medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. J. O'Meara, L. C. Henry, Frank Hayward, and Frank A. Watt, protesting against various items of pending emergency revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of citizens of Gorham, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of the Twenty-first Avenue Baptist Sunday School and Baptist Sunday School of San Francisco, Cal., for Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Owl Drug Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of Edward Brown and 59 others, all residents of Thomaston, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of Baptist Young People's Union of Guthrie, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of Congregational Church of Conroy and Union of the Methodist, Congregational, and Christian Churches of Sheffield, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of pharmacists of Greenfield, Mass., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.